This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600096603U

CHRISTIANITY

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY.

CHRISTIANITY

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY:

A RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY
OF THE IMMEDIATE PAST,
ACCORDING TO THE SPIRIT OF JESUS.

BY

ETIENNE CHASTEL,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH
BY
JOHN R. BEARD, D.D.

"The work of Christianizing the world is immense, and requires the efforts of each and all. By these the Church will be spread, by those it will be purified. The brute metal which some will extract from the mine, others will cleanse of its dross, others refine in the crucible; and by these combined operations, accomplished under the direction of the Master, the human family, always increasing in number, will be led to the knowledge of its Heavenly Father, in the communion of Jesus."—CONCLUDING WORDS.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1874.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON, 178, STRAND.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF THE AUTHOR.

THE learned, accomplished and venerable author of the following pages was born in Geneva, the 11th of July, 1801, of an old and cultured family of Montbeliard, in the department of the Vosges, which was compelled to expatriate itself in the time of the persecutions of the Lutheran prince, Jean Frederic, Duke of Würtemberg. On the maternal side, the Rev. Stephen Chastel descends equally from a family of refugees, which was forced, for the cause of religion, to quit the South of France. In a parentage so truly estimable, the youth had sufficient reason for consecrating himself to the work of the ministry, his natural call to which he may be allowed to feel he has not dishonoured in the course of a long and chequered professional life. Some slight circumstances in his early studies, and the desire of his father to keep him by his side after the premature decease of his mother, finally determined his destination to the ecclesiastical career. He commenced his theological studies at the outbreak of the religious dissensions of his native city, the same year (1819) in which the partizans of the orthodox revival re-edited the Helvetic Confession of 1566, insisting that Geneva, recently re-united to Switzerland, should

impose that old and voluminous formulary on all its pastors and professors of theology. The despotic pretensions sustained in the face of a Church which had for a century been proud of having abolished all confessions of faith, and of thenceforth depending solely on the gospel, determined his choice in the subject of his academical thesis. Delivered in 1823, under the title, "The Use of Confessions of Faith in Reformed Communities," if it displeased the retrograde party, it had the privilege of being honoured by the commendations of Sismondi, who cited it in an article of *La Revue Encyclopédique* of Paris, 1826.

The suffrage of the illustrious historian encouraged the young essayist. Among the diverse branches of theology, the History of the Church was that which, from the first, won his affection. A sojourn in Paris, where he attended the lectures of Villemain, and was present at the discussion of the famous law on Sacrilege; an abode in Italy under the Pontificate of the fanatical Leo XII.; a journey into England, where he received from the lips of different theologians, in particular from those of John James Tayler, afterwards Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Manchester New College, information which he highly valued on the religious condition of the country;—all this only cultivated and strengthened his taste for historical studies. Those studies he pursued in Geneva during the course of a laborious pastorate. But he soon became aware that Germany alone offered in this matter sufficient resources. He therefore gave his mind to the writings of Gieseler, Neander, their predecessors and disciples, and in 1835 turned to account their labours in a series of lectures intended to prepare the Genevese public for the Jubilee of the

Reformation, which it was on the point of celebrating. Surprised on that occasion to find the Protestant population so little instructed in the principal evolutions of the Church, he undertook to trace them for their advantage in four new series of lectures, which in 1839 led to his nomination to the chair of Ecclesiastical History. There he was not long in coming upon rocks which he had not foreseen. Certain appreciations of some historical facts in the evangelical history which had long been current in Germany, even in orthodox circles, astonished some of his young French auditors. Immediately the Evangelical dissidents sounded the alarm in France and in Switzerland against the pastoral body which had appointed him: the latter was moved by their attacks; his position was threatened, and he owed its preservation only to the devotedness of certain friends. Escaped from this danger, he soon saw himself in presence of another. The Council of State had just confided to him the direction of the public Library, when the Revolution of 1846 broke out in the city. The ecclesiastical body had judged him too liberal; the radical government found him too conservative. A new law obliged him to choose between the functions of the Librarian and those of the Professor. He could not hesitate, although under that government the Professorship itself was not sheltered from all attack. But in confining himself to the office of teaching, he wished, if he could, to justify the efforts of the noble friends who had given themselves much trouble to maintain him in it. In 1847, the Parisian *Academy of Inscriptions* offered a prize for the best essay on *The History of the Fall of Paganism in the Eastern Empire.* With the aid of numerous resources which his duties as a Librarian enabled

him to consult, he treated the question in such a manner as to obtain the honour. At the moment when it crowned his labour, the *French Academy (the Institute)*, acting under the social crisis of 1848 and 1849, offered a prize for the best essay on *Christian Charity in the First Centuries.* He entered with ardour on this new subject and the historical studies required by the programme: he added to the results considerations drawn from his pastoral experience on *The Part of Charity* (or Christian love) *in our Modern Societies.* His essay, crowned *ex æquo* with that of Professor Schmidt, of the University of Strasburg, had the high honour of sharing with his the extraordinary prize proposed by the Academy. Entirely occupied for a long time with his favourite science, whose gigantic steps he could scarcely follow, and not expecting, on account of his age, to be able to publish the whole of his course, he resolved at least to deposit its substance in four volumes, which have successively appeared, and of which this is the last.*

* Christianity in the First Nineteen Centuries: 1st Part, Christianity in the Six First Centuries, 12mo; 2nd Part, Christianity in the Middle Ages, 12mo; 3rd Part, Christianity in Modern Ages, 12mo; which (the translator adds) are not less instructive, interesting and liberal, than the fourth volume now laid before the English public.

A FEW WORDS OF EXPLANATION BY THE TRANSLATOR.

ACQUAINTANCE with the first of the four parts which in union transmute our author's "Christianity in the Nineteenth Century" into his "Christianity in the Nineteen Centuries," or a History of Christianity from the earliest ages, and a high appreciation of the merits of that first part, induced me to obtain and peruse the present volume. So great was the gratification which I received from the study, that I resolved, with the consent of the author, to lay it before the English public. And I was the rather inclined to perform the task because it would enable me to renew literary ties with the city of Geneva formed as early in the century as 1831, when M. Duby, Professor of Theology and Eloquence in the Protestant University of Geneva, gave his valuable aid to the second of my two volumes of "Sermons designed to be used in Families," which among their contributors bear the honoured names of John James Tayler, J. G. Robberds, R. Wallace, W. J. Fox, J. Hutton, John Kenrick, C. Wellbeloved, H. Montgomery, James Martineau, at home; and J. Tuckerman, H. Ware, F. Parkman, M. Duby, abroad. The reference carries me back over a period of

more than forty years of a long and busy life, and gives me an impressive illustration of the surpassing value of the principles which it has been my happiness to hold in common with those religious and highly cultivated members of the truly "Broad Church" of Christ.

In some sort the volume I present to the English public is a *resumé* of those principles. That fact constitutes its intrinsic value. It is also an indirect history of their progress. What a distance has society passed over in the way of religious amelioration since the earlier years of this century! The footsteps of that distance are in these pages clearly and sharply marked, together with the influences out of which they issued, and the immediate consequences to which they have conduced, with a certain vaticinatory prospect, full of hope and encouragement, of better things to come. The work is an unfolding of the heart and life of the nineteenth century in all its principal aspects, done by a hand equally skilful, experienced, reverend and loving, such as might be expected to grow out of constant and intimate contact with the hand of Jesus. Professor Chastel has taken Christ with him, Christ and no one else, in this instructive and charming survey of the Church and the world, or of Christian civilization during this springtide of the new year of the Lord. The tone and tendency of the work, while rigorously just, is hopeful and cheering, and so an attentive perusal of it will tend to correct despondency, remove doubt, and generally edify in that "faith, hope and charity," which constitute the essence, as of Christianity, so of all true religion.

There is no feature in this book which will strike the reader more than its rigorous impartiality. The names of all

the great leaders of religious thought in the present century find mention in these pages in a tone of simple justice, however near or however distant they stand from their judge, the learned and benevolent author. Totally free from bias, and neither fearing nor courting orthodoxy or heterodoxy, whatever their shades, he justly characterizes alike the Catholic and the Protestant, the Calvinist and the Arminian, nor does he pass in neglect the Unitarian. His treatment of the latter class not only exemplifies his love of fair-play, but illustrates his minute and discriminating method of handling his subject. Here we find Priestley, Channing and Parker truly placed in their own high position, but so characterized relatively to each other, as in a few words to present a history of religious movements among the modern Unitarians. And here his special theological predilection comes into view, yet without being displayed. Mons. Chastel has a strong attachment to our late beloved friend, John James Tayler. Accordingly, among his multifarious minor productions we find a *brochure* which bears for title, *John James Tayler, a Biographical Notice* (1873), in which that pure-minded and tender-hearted man is drawn in outline, not only correctly and faithfully, but with an obvious leaning as of the heart of the biographer to the heart of his subject. As confirmatory of these statements, we quote from the pamphlet the following paragraph :—"The details into which we have entered permit us, it seems to me, to consider Tayler as one of the heads of that modern Unitarian school, already so numerous in America, which, entirely detached from that of Priestley, whose literalism, dry and narrow, excited little sympathy in him, uniting on the contrary, as that of Channing, to width of view, prac-

tical activity and the unction of Christian sentiment,—is superior to him in critical and historical science, owing to the light and impulse which it had received from Germany. In one of the anniversary meetings of the Unitarian Association, Tayler characterized this new school. 'It cannot be denied that, in the formation of its judgments in the matter of religion, our generation has resources more abundant than its predecessor. There result among us dogmatic types not a little diverse. Some, applying with faith and sincerity to the New Testament what they consider as the principles of true exegesis, return in some degree to sympathize rather with a modified orthodoxy. Others, with an equal sincerity, an equal attachment to Christianity, have been led by the progress of Science to give more importance to the spirit than the letter, and to admit in the examination of the New Testament a large spirit of historical research, which is represented in America by Theodore Parker'" (p. 40). This progress, thus described by Mr. Tayler, has continued to the present hour, producing happily one result—that the life of Jesus, in its broad and essential historical outlines, is the essence of Christianity. It is pleasant to add, that to this all-sufficient conclusion the leading minds of Protestant Christianity are at this moment manifestly, if slowly, converging. Hence it ensues that the life of the true Christian is the life that is moulded and inspired after the image of Jesus. This thought is the central principle of the present volume, and because it is so, I have thought it my duty and found it my pleasure to put its contents into my native tongue. The breadth of the thought is such, that the volume may prove serviceable to all who prefer Christ to themselves.

I must not conclude without tendering to the author my grateful acknowledgments of the pleasure and profit I have derived from his work, and of the truly Christian courtesy with which he entered into my proposal for publishing this product of his mature culture and vivid piety in an English dress.

JOHN R. BEARD.

The Meadows,
Ashton-on-Mersey, near Manchester,
November 17, 1874.

CONTENTS.

First Part.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG CHRISTIANS.

CHAP. PAGE

I.—Christian Revival and Retrograde Christianity.

1. In Catholicism 5
2. In Protestantism and the Greek Church 28
3. Return of Conflicts between the Civil Order and the Religious 56
4. Return of Confessional (or Dogmatic) Struggles 70

II.—Anti-Christian Reaction.

1. In Catholic Nations 82
2. In Protestant and Greek Nations 91

III.—Christian Progress.

1. Progress in Liberty 102
2. Progress in Truth 129
3. Progress in Moral and Religious Life 178

Second Part.

CHRISTIANITY IN NON-CHRISTIAN NATIONS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	—Christianity and Judaism	199
II.	—Christianity and Mohamedanism	211
III.	—Christianity and Polytheism	218

CHRISTIANITY

IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY.

First Part.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG CHRISTIANS.

In the religious order, as in the intellectual and social, the progress to which God invites humanity is not possible except on two conditions: the maintenance of the conquests, which it has been privileged to make in the domain of the true and the good, and a clear path to all other conquests which it may be privileged to make in the future. But it is rare for these conditions to be sufficiently understood by the men and the parties who undertake to direct its advance. Now their respect for the past makes them obstinately retain imperfect beliefs and institutions; now their impatient flight toward the future makes them repudiate beneficial institutions and important truths for the sole reason that they are old, or blindly embrace systems which a ripe examination has not yet justified. This

person respects even useless constructions which encumber and disfigure his abode; that, at the risk of remaining unsheltered, is eager to demolish it. This person prunes and cuts his tree unsparingly; that, lets his tree perish under the weight of its dead branches. This person rejects the precious metal on account of its envelope; that, fearing to lose a part of his gold, scrupulously leaves it unproductive in some hiding-place. It is still more rare for one of these extremes not to bring the other. Now frightened at sudden changes, humanity not less suddenly turns on its heels toward the past. Now impeded in that past too indistinctly accepted, it rejects its most respectable conditions. Thus it passes from one excess to another, coasts along the precipices which line its route, hastens from reactions into revolutions, from revolutions into reactions, ever oscillating between anarchy and despotism, between servility and licentiousness, tossed by contrary parties from one to the other as they get the upper hand; and thus would it go on ceaselessly without gaining ground, had not God made it accessible to the lessons of experience, or if, from time to time, He had not allowed it to find on its path instructed guides, who, with their eye fixed on their object, direct its progressive steps through the labyrinth of rocks. Such guides, between the most stationary Catholicism and the most destructive Anabaptism, were in the sixteenth century the wisely progressive reformers who, taking the Church back from the evil ways in which it was retained by faithless guides, and from those in which frantic innovators threatened to lead it astray, brought it near to that which Jesus himself had marked out for it. Humanity then does advance, as God wills and provides; but it does not advance, as is desired by infirm individuals, like that drunken peasant to which it

is compared by Luther, who moves only in a series of oscillations and ups and downs. At a later time we see in Christendom in general, and in each of the great communions into which it is divided, the same opposite tendencies actuate minds and dispute each for the preponderance. But never were those struggles more severe or more continuous, never were their alternations of victory and defeat more sudden and decided, than in the threescore years and ten which have elapsed within the present century. The great crisis of the sixteenth century was followed by the immobility of the seventeenth, and then came the subversive spirit of the eighteenth. In our age—and this is one of its most prominent features—we see the extreme conservative parties and the unsparingly destructive ones, engaged in ceaseless conflicts, gain the advantage one after another; each political or social revolution preparing itself by a crisis of irreligion, accompanied in the Church by a retrograde movement, while Christian progress disengages itself from the warring elements only insensibly and not without effort. Hence it appears that the internal history of Christianity in our age cannot be summed up better than in three pictures in which you will see successively in operation, among the different Christian communions, each of the three parties, the three currents which we have just indicated—together with the circumstances which made each in turn predominate, and the principal facts which were produced under their influence. Accordingly, we shall develope our ideas under the guidance of this tabular view of the contents of these essays.

First Part.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG CHRISTIANS.

Chap. I.—Christian Revival and Retrograde Christianity.

1. In Catholicism.
2. In Protestantism and the Greek Church.
3. Return of Conflicts between the Civil Order and the Religious.
4. Return of Confessional (or Dogmatic) Struggles.

Chap. II.—Anti-Christian Reaction.

1. In Catholic Nations.
2. In Protestant and Greek Nations.

Chap. III.—Christian Progress.

1. Progress in Liberty.
2. Progress in Truth.
3. Progress in Moral and Religious Life.

Second Part.

CHRISTIANITY IN NON-CHRISTIAN NATIONS.

Chap. I.—Christianity and Judaism.

„ II.—Christianity and Mohamedanism.

„ III.—Christianity and Polytheism.

CHAPTER I.

CHRISTIAN REVIVAL AND RETROGRADE CHRISTIANITY.

I.

CATHOLICISM.

NEVER does a people return to its ancient beliefs with more ardour than after the extreme calamities which followed a long period of oblivion. The fact is illustrated in the Jewish people during and after its captivity, and in the Roman people during the critical periods of its history. It is illustrated also in the nations of Europe after the catastrophes of the last century, and specially in France after the Reign of Terror. We say enough in remarking that the current of religious restoration is that which prevailed at the commencement of this century, and that it was in France that it most suddenly made its appearance. Violent revolutions may for a time turn every thing upside down—perhaps shake for ever the institutions of a nation—but they cannot stifle in the individuals which compose it the instinctive sentiments of human nature. The French democracy, eager to abolish a detested political form of government, not satisfied with sapping the ecclesiastical institutions connected therewith, hastened to pro-

scribe all religious manifestation, to close the churches, to banish the priests, to pursue even into the sanctuary of private life all trace of attachment to the ancient worship, and finally to inaugurate the reign of Atheism. The religious sentiment forcibly suppressed in the soul acquired only greater spring, and reacted only with more vigour. All that during this disastrous period had suffered in their interests, their person, or their affections, all that did suffer, all that were menaced with suffering, turned back towards the supreme Consoler, the sole support of the oppressed, and reproaching in His ears their past neglects, thought only of being reconciled to Him by sincere contrition and thorough repentance. Even those who, more or less strangers to these pious emotions, had reckoned on the natural progress of civilization for securing the morality and weal of nations, cruelly deceived by the spectacle of anarchy which they had under their eyes, began to recognize in religion an educating power which nothing can replace. Doubtless they could have wished to see it revive under purer forms; but the peace, the repose which they promised themselves on its restoration, prevailed for the moment over every other consideration. Men's minds were no longer indulging in criticism; whatever bore the impress of sincere piety obtained respect and sympathy. The word of the priests, previously so decried owing to their worldly lives, renewed and re-invigorated by their sufferings, recovered its former authority. Scarcely were the churches re-opened when they were filled by compact and devout audiences. In more than forty thousand communes or parishes the Catholic worship was instantly restored. The press quitted its hostile attitude toward it. Chateaubriand, returning into France, still imbued with the ideas of the eighteenth century, finding

men's minds raised to another key, withdrew his "Essay on the Revolution," and, amid the acclamations of the French public, published his Génie du Christianisme *(Genius of Christianity)*. Philosophy itself, without yet becoming positively Christian, made an approach to religion. The sensualism of Condillac followed the materialism of Lamettrie in its discredit. The wise spiritualism of Reed and Stewart, after in England triumphing over Hume's scepticism, took root in France. Ampère, Maine de Biran, Jouffroy, Cousin, Roger Collard professed *its* doctrines with distinction. Then it was thought that in France philosophy had divorced itself from Atheism, and it was announced that the progress of a sound psychology would render the return of Atheism impossible. The following is the way in which Sismondi characterized the state of opinion at this time. "When the Church," he says in a letter to Channing, "had been overturned by the double effort of the Encyclopedists and the Revolutionists, when specially a little calm had succeeded to the tempest, the need of tender affections, the need of confidence and hope, admiration for creation, the sentiment of the spirituality of our nature, the thirst for immortality, made themselves felt in human hearts. . . . Nearly all men accustomed to think, and whose opinions were formed before the Revolution, belong still to the school of Voltaire; but they are now seventy years of age, and they are alone. . . . No one aged seventy and less, who knows how to write, who exercises the least influence, professes a mocking incredulity; doubt there is, but also desire to acquire more elevated opinions; there is a want of religion and of respect for beliefs which, nevertheless, few adopt completely. This is France; it is by no means Italy or Spain." "No one can more skilfully," adds Saint-Beuve,

"explain the causes of the revival of religion in 1800." Policy was naturally compelled to pay attention to such symptoms. Seeing French society eager to re-seat itself, to breathe again under the shadow of the worship which had been proscribed by the enemies of its repose, the Consul Bonaparte judged that liberty of conscience, proclaimed in the republican constitutions, but so little respected by even those by whom it had been decreed, would not suffice to reassure religious souls. He resolved to take under his own protection the worship which he meant to re-establish, and with that view entered into negociations with the new Pope, Pius VII. (1800—1823). By that, he thought, he gained in every country the suffrage of the Catholic populations; he freed Italy from the yoke of Austria, and attached it to the interests of France; he removed the clergy from the royalist opposition, the Pope from the European coalition, and then made use of both to incline his people to obedience. "When I shall rebuild the altars, when I shall protect the priests, when I shall feed them," he said to his counsellors, "the Pope, for the sake of general repose, will calm men's minds, will re-unite them under his hand, and will place them in mine." Then, carrying his views still further, "You will see," he added privately; "the advantage I shall obtain from the priests." The imperial crown which already he, the new Charlemagne, aspired to place on his head would receive the Pope's benediction, and in the eyes of the other powers the sacred unction would serve him instead of legitimacy. From that ambitious policy, full of foresight, proceeded the Concordat of the 15th July, 1801. "It was," says Quinet, "his visit to the sands of Jupiter Ammon."

Catholicism was then re-established as the religion of the majority of Frenchmen; the clergy, in place of its

ancient properties which remained alienated, was provided with an annual salary sufficient for its support and the requirements of worship; ten archbishops and fifty bishops, appointed by the Government and instituted by the Pope, directed the Church of France, which was afresh placed under the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

This was something considerable for a clergy not long since proscribed, and for a Pontiff who was but just re-installed in Rome. Yet was it little for a Pontiff and a clergy whose ambition, excited by the return of public favour, already dreamt of the return of the Church to its former domination. The articles of 1802, surreptitiously added to the Concordat, and the subsequent acts of Napoleon, soon scattered that flattering dream, and introduced between the two contracting parties that state of perpetual strain which we shall shortly describe—that series of conflicts which ended in the fall of Pius VII., in his exile and captivity, and issued in the dethronement of the Emperor himself.

Here the movement of the retrograde restoration begins to become general. Not only in France, but in all Europe, under the favour of the reaction brought on by Napoleon's fall, Catholicism labours to repair its breaches, and the revival of the beginning of the century is transformed into a reaction henceforward more ecclesiastical and political than religious, in which the interests of religion are confounded with the interests of the priest, as the interests of states were confounded with those of sovereigns.

During the wars of the Revolution and of the Empire the Catholic powers had particularly suffered. The sovereigns of Italy and Spain, the ecclesiastical princes of Germany, had been dethroned to make way for the members of the new Imperial family; those of Austria, of

Bavaria, after seeing their capitals and their provinces occupied and dearly ransomed, had been obliged to submit to the law of the conqueror. On his fall there was one, and only one, voice for restoring downcast thrones, dynasties and aristocracies, and for re-constituting dismembered or dissolved nationalities. Moreover, there was one, and only one, voice for arresting the torrent of revolutionary passions which the armies of France had everywhere set in movement, and which already threatened serious peril; for the citizens claimed the constitutions so strongly promised, and which the authorities still hesitated to bestow. Still trembling from the shock which they had suffered, the legitimate royalties sought support everywhere. The clergy, who had shared their reverses (in some places even their ill fortunes and their exile), presented themselves to them with confidence. The throne, they said, cannot stand except on the basis of the altar. Give us your subjects faithful Catholics; we will return them to you sincerely monarchical. Multiply in your dominions religious establishments, and you will find them as many outposts for your power; replace in our hands the education of the young, and we will render the coming generations as supple as philosophy made them indocile and stubborn. Restore our authority, and it will shelter you under its prestige. Support us, and we will support you. This language was understood. The ecclesiastical restoration, considered as the complement of the political restoration, was seconded with ardour by the powers.

Quite naturally the Bishop of Rome hastened to profit by dispositions so propitious. Formerly dethroned by a Catholic power, now restored on his seat and his dominions by four powers, of whom one was schismatic and two Protestant, received in triumph by his subjects, who re-

vered in him the captive of Savona and Fontainebleau,* Pius VII. nevertheless, gathering wisdom from his dishonours, would willingly make, at least in the sphere of administration, concessions to the spirit of the age. Such was the advice of Consalvi, his faithful councillor. The fanaticism of the zealots gained the upper hand in the Sacred College. In the patrimony of Saint Peter, everything was placed on the old footing; the Code Napoleon had for substitute the Canon Law, the government of the provinces was restored to the Cardinal legates, the civil charges in Rome were confided exclusively to ecclesiastics, the chapters and the monasteries were replaced in possession of those whose properties were not alienated, and, even under Leo XII. (1823—1829), of all the alienation of which had not been agreed to by the Pope. The Roman nobility and clergy were re-established in all their privileges; under the same Pope the prisons of the Inquisition were rebuilt to receive the Carbonari and the Freethinkers, while the right of asylum, restored in favour of the Holy Office, was to shelter the malefactors who would engage to cultivate their possessions.

But the restorative views of the Pope did not bear alone on his own States. His solicitude embraced the entire Church, and one of the first acts of Pius VII. after his return, was to re-establish that famous Order in which the Church had, during two centuries, found its strongest bulwark, and which Clement XIV. (1769) had suppressed only under the irresistible pressure of his age. In truth, that suppression had never been either in earnest or complete. Disguised here under the name of "Liguorians"

* Places where Napoleon Bonaparte held Pope Pius VII. prisoner.—*Translator.*

or "Redemptorists," then under that of "Fathers of the Faith," the Jesuits had in many a land retained in their hands the instruction of the young. Pius VII., however, thought that he owed to them distinguished reparation. He augmented their endowments, restored their confessionals, enriched their colleges, and finally gave them a position which enabled them everywhere to direct the work of ecclesiastical restoration.

And what moment more favourable for seconding their efforts? It was the period when, in France, De Bonald, Lamennais, d'Ekstein, Joseph de Maistre; in Switzerland, the convert C. L. de Haller; in Germany, Fred. Schlegel, the editors of the "Cierge," of "L'Ami de la Religion," supported by the simultaneous impulse of "the historical school" and of the Romantic literature, spoke of carrying back the Church to the glorious days of Gregory VII. (1073) and Innocent III. (1198). It was the time when jubilees, processions, pilgrimages, pious fraternities, missions, plantations of the cross, regained favour; when the perpetual worship of the sacred hearts of Jesus and of Mary, established in 1804 at Picpus, had just been sanctioned by the Pope, and when those bloody symbols were carried up and down in Paris; when the Prince of Hohenlohe offered to cure all diseases from the centre of his oratory, when Migné's Cross appeared in the skies, as in the days of Constantine; when in the diocese of Cologne a flame came of itself to light on the Virgin's crown; when the stigmatics* of the Tyrol showed on their hands the wounds of the Saviour bleeding every Friday. While by these practices the priests laboured to galvanize popular devo-

* Fanatics who pretend that they bear the wounds inflicted on Jesus when on the Cross. They are said to bleed spontaneously every now and then. N.B. Soap and water are an effectual cure.—*Translator.*

tion, the emissaries of the Holy See crept into the houses of princes, and by the heat of their prayers for the safety of crowns and the salvation of states, obtained solid advantages for the Church. If some Courts—those of Portugal, Parma, Tuscany—yielded to their suggestions only with reserve, Ferdinand VII. (1823) on his return into Spain, was dispatchful in nothing more than to restore to vigour the Concordat of 1753, to recall the Jesuits, to re-establish the Inquisition. The abortive revolutions of 1821 served only to confirm the clerical influence in Italy and elsewhere. The Duke of Modena suppressed the university of that city, and gave to the clergy the direction of public instruction. The Court of Naples, in its turn, recalled the Jesuits. In Switzerland, the Cantons of Fribourg and of the Vallais founded in their favour splendid establishments of education, which soon became the focus of an intense Ultramontane agitation. The new federal pact of 1815 was to guarantee the existence and the properties of the convents. The part of Switzerland which previously depended on the diocese of Constance, was detached from it and placed under the authority of an apostolic vicar, while awaiting the erection of two new bishoprics, which depended directly on the Pope. Austria established a most rigorous censorship of the press, exacted from the functionaries of the State, under the supervision of the bishops, their regular attendance on the ceremonies of worship, required students to confess six times a-year, forbade them to visit foreign universities, banished history and physics from the State schools; finally, in its Italian provinces, gave full scope to clerical manœuvres. Bavaria, then its faithful satellite, followed Austria on this path. In 1817, it concluded with the Holy See a concordat which with reason was proposed as a model for sovereigns who

were zealous on behalf of the Roman religion. The number and the endowments of the bishoprics, as well as of the monastic institutions, had greatly increased then; the Pope confirmed the bishops, received from them the annates or annual tributes, named the heads, and in part the members of the chapters; all books denounced as dangerous by the bishops were to be suppressed; finally, all the privileges consecrated by canonical law were to be secured to the Catholic religion. In this same year, 1817, similar measures were proposed for France. Thence, it was said, the wind of incredulity had first swept over Europe; there, consequently, it was most urgent to restore the empire of faith. The point involved nothing less than the suppression of the organic articles, the abolition even of the Concordat of 1801, to return to that of 1516, to re-establish the suppressed bishoprics, to restore to the clergy the civil registers and its territorial endowments. The enormity of this project and the protests of enlightened royalists prevented its being submitted to discussion in the Chambers. But at least an effort was made by all possible means to give back to France its ancient religious physiognomy. Catholicism was raised to the rank of the religion of the State, and while in 1815 base men made use of that title to organize in the South a massacre of Protestants, the Government cited before the tribunals writers that were hostile to the established worship; by the law of sacrilege, under colour of punishing an indecent profanation of the host, it caused, as Roger Collard remarked so eloquently in Parliament, the fundamental dogma of Catholicism to be inscribed on the French Code. Divorce was abolished as contrary to the Canons of the Church; marriage was forbidden to priests that had resigned their functions in order to secure, it was

said, the secrecy of confession; the article of the penal code, directed by Napoleon against suspected political meetings, was made to bear on dissident religious assemblies, which were thus left at the mercy of local civil officers, and converted into a lie the article of the charter which consecrated the liberty of worship. Add to all this the annual increase in the clerical budget, the enormous salaries allotted to the cardinals, the expedition into Spain, undertaken for the benefit of the Church as much as for that of royalty, the exclusive choice of civil functionaries among the members of the "Congregation," the Minister of Worship and the Minister of Public Instruction united in the hands of a bishop, the suppression of the schools of mutual instruction for the benefit of the schools of "the Brethren of Christian Doctrine," the exclusion of independent professors from the chairs which they occupied in the university, their replacement by Jesuits; finally, the lay youth attracted in crowds into the small seminaries destined at the beginning for ecclesiastical instruction exclusively, and directed in the narrowest spirit. The revolution of 1830 (Louis Philippe), although occasioned in great part by the bigotry of the house of Bourbon, brought only a pause in the work of Catholic restoration. It is true, the title of religion of the State was taken from the dominant worship, and the law of sacrilege and some decrees too extreme were abolished. But the long civil troubles which followed this crisis, those to which it gave occasion in the rest of Europe, the revolutions of Switzerland, those of Poland, Belgium, the rising in the Romagna, the apprehension of a new European war, which was expected to break out every day, above all, the new social theories of Fourier, Owen, St. Simon, which, favoured by the liberty of the press, began to spread abroad, the credit they found among the labour-

ing classes, the sanguinary outbreaks in Paris and Lyons which they produced, the reiterated attacks on the person of the new King, did not alarm only the governments, and the privileged classes; the middle class itself, scarcely put in possession of its rights, saw its interests threatened; family relations, property, ceased to be owned as inviolable; the working classes, whose lot had been worsened by revolutionary agitation, being stirred up by ambitious agitators, declared themselves in an intolerable state of oppression and slavery which demanded a fresh distribution of wealth. Socialism and Communism were openly advocated; new revolutions seemed imminent. In these threatening symptoms the clergy appeared to see only a fresh opportunity for increasing its influence, for running riot against the spirit of free inquiry, against the press, against the academies, against science, against liberty of all kinds. Gregory XVI. was equal to the occasion. While with the aid of Austrian garrisons he reduced his Roman subjects into order, his celebrated Encyclic served him for the purpose of combatting liberal ideas; nor were his efforts unsuccessful. "Every class," says Tocqueville, "stood by religion in the degree in which they saw it threatened or smitten. The citizen class, terrified by the demagogues, as much as courted by the Church, which seemed to zealously take its cause in hand, redoubled their deference for the sacred institution. Several even of those who under the reign of Charles X. had stood up most firmly against the pretensions and enterprizes of the clergy, seeing the civil power so insecure, began to consider the influence of the ministers of the altar as a bridle on the young, a mound against the rising waves of the democracy, a means of tranquillizing popular passions, and the monastic associations of labour and charity as preservatives against

socialism. The measures, not very liberal, it is true, previously sought for against those societies, were left on one side or indefinitely adjourned; the "Brethren of Christian Schools" were maintained at the head of the primary teaching; the religious seminaries continued for the lay youth to compete with the university courses. The Government approached the Sovereign Pontiff, purchased the prayers of the Church by important concessions, closed its eyes on the multiplication of the religious orders, and when, after the conferences of Father Ravignan, the pretended "Fathers of the Faith" ventured to appear under their own name, the only reply made to the complaints uttered against their illegal intrusion was a seeming repression concerted with their general, and which changed scarcely anything in their situation. Better off at Court than ever, the Jesuits were the principal instruments of that retrograde movement which was everywhere favoured by the terrors of the middle classes. The revolution, which its enemies thought they could ward off by all these means, broke out nevertheless, and in a form more terrible than the preceding one. Like it, it broke out with the cry of, "Down with the Jesuits!" But always supple before force, as well as haughty before weakness, the clergy bent their head under the storm; feigning to believe the insurrection directed by Catholic principles against a King whom they accused of being half a Protestant, they conferred their benediction on "Trees of Liberty," and sang in their public services, Salvam fac Rempublicam (*O Lord, save the* REPUBLIC!) waiting for the time when they could sing their old song of, *O Lord, save the* KING! in favour of some pretender disposed to repay their services.

This moment could not be distant. Every new revolution, in extending the suffrage down to strata of the

population, always less instructed, whose sole teachers were monks, more and more favoured the influence of the clergy, who, directing the votes, bade high for political supremacy. The sovereignty of the people proclaimed in 1848, thus became the sovereignty of the priests. Much astonished, doubtless, were those who had called forth this movement, and who thought themselves able enough to conduct it, when the first elections brought forth from the urn names dearest to the clergy; when a law, jesuitically presented as if for the liberty of teaching, devolved the principal direction on the bishops; when the separation of Church and State, formerly claimed with so much urgency, was indefinitely adjourned; when ecclesiastical celibacy was upheld, the election of the parish priests taken out of the hands of the parishioners; when the inferior clergy was left under the control of the bishops; and when, finally, the French Republic, declaring war to her sister in Rome, undertook to replace, and henceforward to retain in his see, the Pontiff whom it had removed from it. After this exploit, Napoleon III., for whom his promises to the clergy had gained the President's chair, had only to stoop in order to rise, wearing the crown that had fallen from his uncle's head. From that moment the Catholic restoration boldly pursued its way. Religious liberty figured no longer in the new Constitution, except in profile and incidentally, according to the inclinations of a senate in which sat cardinals little eager to protect it. Religious assemblies, as well as political meetings, were again subjected to previous authorization. In the programmes of instruction, historical and philosophical studies, alleged to be injurious to religion, were reduced to a minimum. Literary men, who had thrown most lustre on preceding reigns, were put and kept in the shade. The bishops,

prodigal in flattery, at each new concession which they solicited, became menacing as soon as the Imperial favour seemed to grow cold; they were well aware of the need there was for them in the renewal of the legislatures. Finally, owing to the terrors ably kept in a population "which," as Tocqueville remarks, "walks constantly between two fears—that of socialism and that of the priests—and which to escape from the one only gives itself to the other," a revival of the monkish spirit was not long in making its appearance. Pious foundations, territorial and others, now publicly, now secretly authorized by the State, and augmented by much inveigling, multiplied beyond measure. The number of monks and nuns in France surpassed what it had been in the first Revolution; that of the Jesuits, in particular, amounted in 1864 to nearly one-third of their number in the Catholic world.*

The same influences made themselves felt in several of the wars fought under the last reign (1853). The old quarrel respecting "the Holy Places" served for a pretext to the expedition to the Crimea. The complaints of some missionaries caused those of China and Cochin-China to

* I copy from a Catholic work entitled, "The Council of the Vatican and the Events of the Time:"—"SOCIETY OF JESUS. Very Rev. Peter Becks was Provost-General of the Society of Jesus at the time of the Council of the Vatican, and the following are the number of priests and scholastics of the Society in the whole world at that time (1869). ITALY: Roman, 235 priests, 97 scholastics; Neapolitan, 192, 41; Sicilian, 139, 14; Turinese, 167, 39; Venetian, 130, 47. GERMANY: Austrian, 174, 134; Belgian, 269, 179; Galician, 68, 84; German, 300, 202; Netherlands, 108, 102. FRANCE: Champagne, 235, 162; France, 332, 177; Lyons, 336, 167; Toulouse, 290, 164. SPAIN: Arragon, 160, 205; Castile, 203, 320; Mexican, 9, 4. ENGLAND: English, 78, 61. UNITED STATES: Maryland, 80, 67; Missouri, 83, 41." Total, 3749, 2427 = 6176. Of this number, 6176, 1909 are in France; that is, about one-third of the whole.—*Translator.*

be undertaken (1857). It was for the interests of a much less honourable clergy that an army was sent to Mexico. The dictator Jaurez (1864), following the example of his predecessors, had made a seizure on the immense property of that clergy, and, in order to brave it out the better, decreed full liberty of worship. The Pope profits by a debt which France would recover in the country. He dazzles the eyes of Napoleon with the glory of founding there a Latin empire capable of arresting the encroachments of the Anglo-Saxon race in the new world. The new Emperor is Maximilian, the Archduke of Austria. He repairs to Rome and asks of the Pope, together with his benediction, authority to levy on the Mexican clergy the funds necessary for the support of his army. The benediction is given, the authorization is promised. But, arrived in Mexico, he finds only repulsion and deceptions. Obliged to struggle at once against the ill-will of the clergy, the troops of the Dictator, and the United States, which were interested in the failure of the enterprize, soon summoned by the latter to quit America—from that time abandoned by Napoleon himself—he dies, shot by his own subjects, while the French army, after unheard-of fatigues and sufferings, return to Europe half destroyed. But could less be done for the holy Pontiff who just before had condescended to be godfather to the Imperial Prince? It would take too much space to pass in review all the features of this Ultramontane reaction in France, in which one is astonished to behold, not indeed professional necromancers such as the editors of the *Monde* and the *Univers*, but men in many respects distinguished by the elevation of their character and the comprehension of their mind.

The same movement took place in all Catholic Europe.

In Germany, the radical constituent Assembly of Frankfort (1849) signalized itself by its concessions to Ultramontanism, and the high clergy assembled at Wurzburg profited by the little solidity of the newly established governments to put out the most excessive pretensions; the Archbishop of Friburg in Brisgau put himself into open revolt against his government. This attitude succeeded for the bishops, and was not without profit to the Sovereign Pontiff. A new Concordat, concluded between Austria and the Holy See (1855), abolished all the liberal measures decreed by Joseph II., and gave up to the clergy the absolute superintendence of the press and that of public instruction. He had, it is true, to acknowledge the gifts which he had received from the Church for his armaments against Italy, to secure them for himself for the future, and to obtain from the Pope an extension of the right to fortify and garrison, previously conceded in the Roman States. The governments of Würtemburg, of the Grand Duchy of Baden, and those of the Duchies of Hesse and Nassau, thought that out of deference for Austria they ought to associate themselves with its retrograde measures (1857-59).

In 1830, the Belgian clergy, impatient to throw off the yoke of Holland, made an alliance with the Republicans, and in concert with them proclaimed in the enfranchised state the four fundamental liberties—that of the press, of worship, of teaching, and of association. It was a skilful step on their part; for in a nation profoundly Catholic, henceforth disembarrassed of the Protestant element, all these liberties turned to the advantage of the Church. The liberty of teaching ensured the prosperity of its schools and of its religious seminaries; the liberty of worship, the pompous publicity of its ceremonies; finally, the liberty

of association, the indefinite multiplication of its monastic establishments, the number of which doubled in the space of ten years. But that did not satisfy the clergy. The liberties of its old auxiliaries gave it umbrage. At the signal given by the Bull of Gregory XVI., it undertook to confiscate them all. To the university of Bruxelles, become too independent, it soon opposed that of Louvain, which it subjected to the strictest Catholicism and to the absolute authority of the bishops. In 1856, the Bishop of Gand issued an interdict against the university and the literary society of that city; the following year, by its preponderant influence in the elections, the Belgian clergy obtained from the Minister a bill which, had it passed into a law, would have given back into the hands of the clergy the supreme direction of the public beneficence. Some years after (1863), in the Catholic congress of Malines, there was set forth that famous plan for the "Christianizing of capital," which, after supplying the deficiency of the papal treasury, gorged five or six stock-jobbers with gold, secured insurance payments to country priests, their partners, and stript thousands of poor and credulous lay members of the Church of their savings, ended in a scandalous law-suit, which in 1871 almost set all Belgium in flames, and which had its like in Munich two years after. In the same way it is on Ultramontane zeal that throughout the Catholic world is raised the productive levy of "Peter's Pence," which, at the time of the first withdrawal of the French troops from Rome (1864), enabled the Pope to engage in his service his garrison of 5000 men, at a later time to remunerate the members of his council, and at the present time to supply the outlays of the palace which it pleases him to call his prison.

Testimonies of devotedness so varied could not fail to

powerfully encourage the conductors of the Ultramontane reaction. But what the Jesuits had principally at heart was to universalize the dogma of the spiritual Supremacy of the Pope. For once let it be admitted that the Bishop of Rome ruled the Church as an absolute sovereign, such a rule could not fail to be altogether propitious for the order which, bound to him by a vow of passive and complete obedience, everywhere arrogated to themselves the right to command in his name. It was necessary then that no authority, not even that of the Universal Church and of General Councils, should surpass that of which the Jesuits asserted they had received the inspirations. It was necessary to erect into a universal monarch that puppet of which they held the strings. It was necessary to settle, once for all, in favour of the Roman see, that question, agitated in all ages and never finally resolved: "What is the organ of the supreme ecclesiastical authority? In whom—in the Pope or in the Councils—resides the infallibility inherent in the Church of Christ?" So grave a decision demanded time and prudence. It was first necessary to make a trial on another question, equally unsettled, but which risked less to call into action self-love and to enkindle passions.

"The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin" was chosen. The first public act of Pius IX. during his exile at Gaeta (in Naples) was to name an ecclesiastical commission to examine this question. On his return to Rome he convoked a kind of conference, composed of two hundred prelates, who unanimously voted in the affirmative. The conception of Mary was free from sin. Who indeed among the judges would have the courage to deprive of this additional honour her to whom the Pontiff affirmed that he owed his safety? Accordingly they supplicated him to

yield to their impatience. In consequence, on the 8th of December, 1854, in presence of the bishops convoked at Rome, but not consulted, Pius IX. proclaimed the new dogma as "obligatory under the penalty of heretical pravity and damnation." Let us in passing observe the bearing of this decree. At the beginning of the restoration, it was still to Christ that the principal homage of Catholics was addressed. They worshipped his body, displayed all bloody on crucifixes along the high roads. He was worshipped in the Host (or victim) carried in the processions of "God's Festival," then the most solemn of all the festivals. He was worshipped, after the Italian manner, as the Divine Infant carried in his mother's arms, who interceded with Him on behalf of sinners. From the time of the decree of 1854, the Mother begins to take precedence of her Son. Henceforward she appears alone in sacred edifices, opening her arms to suffering humanity; she saved the Pontiff in his day of humiliation; she will equally save whosoever believes in her immaculate conception. The Bishop of Rome has so decided, and this worship paid to "God's Mother" was the first step toward the proclamation of the infallibility of Saint Peter.

The second must not be delayed. Ten years after to a day appeared the famous Encyclic of Pius IX. (1864), which, recalling and summing up in a *Syllabus* the numerous politico-ecclesiastical decrees published during his Pontificate, thundered out anathemas against all the modern liberties reputed to be injurious to the Church. This second step was more perilous than the first. It was nothing less than the glove thrown down to the civilization of our age, a bold reverting to the maxims of the middle ages, an impudent summons addressed to

governments to subordinate their policy to that of the Holy See, a daring injunction to the nations to submit in everything to the injunctions of the Bishop of Rome. Strong protests were issued against the *Syllabus;* several princes forbade its publication in their dominions. Then came tortuous explanations. "The Pope," it was said, "did not mean to condemn either modern civilization or modern liberty, but solely the abuses made of those terms. The Encyclic had only a purely theological and pastoral bearing. If the bishops could not, on this occasion, disregard their duty toward the Holy See, the lay members of the Church remained at liberty to fulfil in all conscience their obligations as citizens, and to keep the oaths they had taken to their governments." And the Pope, who had blessed my Lord of Poictiers for his unqualified adhesion, equally blessed my Lord of Orleans for his benevolent explanations, adding, that "as supreme Head of the Church, he could, when and where he would, suspend the effect of his own decrees." Thus the political powers were lulled into slumber; other affairs caused the Encyclic to be forgotten. Meanwhile Pius IX. had, in one of the gravest questions, of his own free will, done a new act of sovereign authority bearing not only on matters of faith and worship, but also on matters of temporal government. A last step remained to be taken; and this was the most important; for who is ignorant that in ancient times General Councils had been universally and even at Rome regarded as possessed of supreme authority in the Church, and that Popes denounced by them as heretics—the Pope Honorius, for instance—had been by their own successors formally acknowledged and anathematized as such? With what face, then, could the Papal authority pretend to the supremacy and to infallibility? This difficulty did not

stop the wily counsellors of Pius IX. "The Œcumenical Councils," you say, "are superior to the Pope; representing the entire Church, they alone can assume the privilege of being exempt from error." But if an Œcumenical Council were itself to declare its authority inferior to that of the Pope, what would be the pretensions of future Councils against this decision? Now to arrive at this result all the batteries were during a long time prepared. For ten years provincial councils, opened in different cities under the orders of Rome, had uttered declarations favourable to Papal infallibility. These declarations were carefully collected to serve when the occasion came. At length it was thought that men's minds were well prepared, and that in the first sittings of the projected Œcumenical Council the dogma would be voted by acclamation. Any way, the Council was convened in Rome; delegates from princes were to take no part in it; votes were to be taken not by nation, but by head; and on the supposition that a certain number of bishops should shew themselves unfavourable to the Pope's designs, supposing that the Pope could not purchase their support, or at least their silence, by the Cardinal's Red Hat and places of all kinds that he had at his disposal, still he had at his service the one hundred and thirty Italian bishops, then that crowd of servile priests that he had rewarded beforehand by making them bishops *in partibus* (infidelium), and that other crowd of general or apostolic vicars to whom he had assigned fictitious episcopal sees in schismatic or Protestant countries, all of whom, as well as the preceding ones, had a right to vote in the Council. Finally, to keep adversaries without and within in a state of submission, to prevent all risings, the Pope, happily for him, had in Rome a good number of French bayonets. But despatch was necessary,

for a war with Prussia was at hand (this was known to none better than to those who had advised it); France might be compelled to withdraw its troops, and to turn to account the presumed happy issue of that war; nothing could be more useful to the Catholic Church than a patent of infallibility delivered to its Head.

Consequently, on the 8th of December the Council, convened eighteen months before, was opened. The event proved that at least in what concerned it the measures were well taken. If the opposition of some deputies from Germany and Hungary was more ardent, more tenacious than had been expected, it failed to effect, before the compact vote of that multitude of pretended bishops convoked from all the ends of the earth, and who, subsidized in Rome, pliantly voted in agreement with the wishes of the Pope, and by their clamours drowned the voices of the independent prelates. Finally, Pius IX., whose impatience was more and more visible, obtained (1870) the decree which recognized in him, as well as in his successors, "the right to pronounce *ex cathedra* infallible decrees on every question concerning faith and morals."

Four days after this memorable decision, the long expected war broke out. But instead of the victories on which the Pope reckoned for gathering the fruits of his triumph in the Vatican, a continuation of unparalleled reverses, and as their sequel the exile, the captivity, the dethronement, struck blow after blow the Monarch, his protector; and then in Paris, not yet recovered from the effects of a long siege, unbridled anarchy displayed its furies in pillage, massacre, conflagration, and chose its principal victims in the clergy.

And now, thus soon after those disasters which it mainly contributed to bring on France, what is the attitude of the

Ultramontane party? What lessons has it gathered from those heaps of ashes and ruins? Who would believe it? Never were those pretensions more haughty, its blindness more complete. At the moment when France, despoiled of two rich provinces, exhausted of men and money, needs for herself all her remaining resources, she is pressed, she is in some way summoned, to arm afresh in order to restore the Papal throne. More than ever she has experienced to what an extent the intelligence, the culture, the civil courage, the sound and manly faith of its children, are necessary to her; and it is by replacing public instruction in the hands of those who hitherto have only degraded minds and patronized ignorance, it is by feeding the people on degrading superstitions, by parading themselves in pilgrimages to Lourdes and Paray-le-Monial, by voting thousands for an expiatory chapel to the Sacred Heart, that statesmen have pretended to labour for the safety of France, and prelates for the revival of religion!

II.

PROTESTANTISM.

THE circumstances which, at the beginning of this century, took the Catholic nations back to their ancient religious traditions, were too grave and too general not to call forth among Protestants, under different forms, a movement of a similar nature. Here also the void which the negations of philosophy had left in men's souls, the impression of horror caused by the crimes of the revolution, of which it was accounted an accomplice, the long and sanguinary wars, and all the calamities that ensued, instinctively led men to religious thoughts. Everywhere a

cry was heard which said, "We must break with the eighteenth century." It was specially needful to heal the wounds which it had inflicted on religion, to return to that God which the world had forgotten, and whose avenging hand lay heavy on them. In England, the return was sudden. The elevated classes which, in the preceding century, had the first given the tone of scepticism or indifference, were the first to return to Christian sentiments and habits. It is during the dark days of the French republic, and those which followed the execution of Louis XVI., when war broke out between the two countries, that the principal pious foundations which still subsist in England have their date. In Germany, in 1799, Schleiermacher addressed to the instructed classes his celebrated "Discourses on Religion," the influence of which made itself specially felt during the War of Independence. "It was," says Gieseler, "understood how much the abandonment of religious and patriotic sentiments had contributed to the debasement and enslavement of the country; afterwards, in the great events which brought the fall of the despot and the emancipation of Germany, men saw the in some sort immediate action of God in the events of the world. Thus the religious sentiment was powerfully awakened, and spread itself in expressions of repentance and gratitude. "God and our Country!" These two words, henceforth closely bound together, echoed throughout Germany. At the same time, M. Necker, his daughter, Madame de Stael, Sismondi, pleaded in France and Switzerland, as did Schleiermacher in Germany, the cause of religious revival; in the same spirit Benjamin Constant finished his great work on religion, which he had commenced at the age of eighteen under the influence of the Encyclopedic school. On all sides there was a concurrence

of efforts to support and to fecundate in men's hearts the rising and growing piety. The more they returned from a distance to their cradle, the more men enjoyed the happiness of the change, and the more, by the communicative expansion of their sentiments, they sought to make them durable in themselves and contagious for their brethren. We have seen that in Catholic lands the religious orders shewed themselves specially active for the revival of piety. In Protestant countries, for similar reasons, it was the dissident bodies, less shackled in their movements than the Churches united to the State, that lent themselves most easily to the new circumstances to which the revolutions had given rise. Unions more intimate and frequent, expressions of sentiment more earnest and copious, means of edification more energetic and more varied, and by that better suited to the divers wants of the masses whom it was wished to gain, could be put in action by independent associations. Thus was it early that you saw at work religious agents—Moravians, Quakers, Baptists, Methodists, and even Swedenborgians—pursuing with new ardour the awakening of piety, not only in lands where they had originated, but in all Christian communions. Near the end of Napoleon's reign, certain small communities, founded in Switzerland and in France by Zinzendorf, were re-organized (1810). From the peace of 1815, a crowd of agents, English and Scotch, Calvinists for the most part, supported by the new Society of "Continental Missions," went forth into the countries which henceforward were open to them. Their views were directed especially toward France. Their object was to unfold, and set up there under the banner of religion, the influence of England, and to destroy, as far as possible, the evil germs left by the revolution. For this purpose it was necessary to commence operations in the

cities where were educated ministers intended to serve the churches of France. Such places were Montauban, Geneva, Lausanne, Strasburg. Owing to the large resources they had at their disposal, those missionaries soon eclipsed the pietistic or Moravian agents by whom they had been preceded, and who, not without a certain bitterness, now claim priority in the work of revival. A young theologian who had (1816) raised his head proudly against the emissaries of Madame Krudener, did not resist the superior ascendancy of the British propagandism. By means of the ecclesiastics and laymen which those agents of diverse societies succeeded in enrolling, were founded schools and chapels, in which they introduced their own means of edification.

Their efforts, when they were directed in the spirit which had animated Spener, Franke, Spangenberg, Penn, Wesley, and when they met with the impulses of enlightened piety in the populations on which they operated, could not fail to fecundate it by the importation of new methods of evangelization, and thus to become, for the constituted churches, a salutary example, and even by rivalry a beneficial stimulant. The same results ensued when those dissidents, fixing themselves in districts where instruction was less common, found in their proselytes diseased or misdirected imaginations, unquiet or fiery temperaments, such as are produced by the critical times through which Europe had passed. In itself nothing more agreeable to the genius of Protestantism than to endeavour, as did several of those congregations, to approach as nearly as possible to the beliefs, the forms of worship, the rules of discipline, which belonged to the primitive church. It is certainly not this which we term retrograde Christianity. Would that all Protestants had retrograded so far—yea,

farther still—so as to find themselves in intimate communion with Jesus! But from not knowing and understanding well the institutions of the primitive Church, and not discerning to what point they were applicable to the present day, several committed mistakes which now led to ridicule, and now called forth legitimate blame. Seeing, not without some grounds, in the Established Churches, unions in which there was little or no Christian edification, in their members worldlings, if not heathen and impious, such as those in face of whom the first Christians found themselves, certain dissidents made separation the most exclusive a duty, which extended from ecclesiastical to private relations, and disregarded the claims of friendship and kindred. This separatism shewed itself specially violent in the pietists of Würtemberg. After having engendered there a thousand troubles, it grew calm only after the foundation of the colony of Kornthal (1818), and by the emigration of the most fanatical of them, who withdrew, some into Southern Russia, the rest into America, where, duped and used by hypocritical leaders, they had severe trials to undergo. The same separatism, placing them beyond the supervision of other Christian communities, favoured in certain dissidents all kinds of grotesque eccentricities. Among some of these pietists, disciples of Michael Hahn, there was a dark asceticism which made celibacy a law; among others, instructed by Pregitzer, there was an assurance of salvation, which, filling them with foolish joy, made them sing their hymns to dancing tunes. Methodism had its "Shakers," "Ranters," "Dancers;" its followers of Anna Lee, with child of a new Messiah; its "New Israelites," who believed it their duty to observe the Jewish Sabbath; finally, its "Protracted Meetings," its noisy "Revivals," imitated from those of America,

which thence propagated themselves into England, Ireland, and even the Continent, with their ordinary accompaniment of groans, sobs, convulsions, which did not always leave after them signs of durable conversion.

The discipline of the primitive Church was also one of the features which the dissidents, especially those that proceeded from the Moravians, wished to appropriate. But in the degree in which each community extended, that discipline, severely required by these, appeared to those difficult to maintain. There ensued violent disputes, which were soon complicated by theological diversities, sometimes also by struggles of self-love or even interest, and which made of their dissidence a sight little edifying for those who were without.

The first Christians, applying to themselves certain declarations of the prophets, represented themselves as speaking and acting under the special direction of the Holy Spirit—an application which did not prevent them from humbly acknowledging their imperfections, any more than from accepting the directions of the more enlightened guides which the Church placed at its head. The sectaries of our age, without always using the same modesty, assumed the same privilege. The Holy Spirit, they gave out, directed all their determinations, and infallibly dictated to them what on all occasions they were to believe, to say, to do. Of what use in future, with the true disciple, are reflection and science? Of what use in the Church the charges which were obtained by thorough instruction and varied culture? The sole gifts of the Holy Spirit (so was it declared at Plymouth, in Geneva, in Lausanne, and by the disciples of John Darby) conferred the right to explain the Scripture. The establishment of charges in the Church originated its degeneration and apostasy. Until the day when the

children of God, now scattered abroad, should be received and united in celestial glory, the absence of government was the sole government that suited the Church; every ecclesiastical community ought to be dissolved; in future there ought to be only assemblies in which each has the right to speak and act according to the gifts he has received. The first Christians, before the books of the New Testament were collected, sought in those of the ancient prophets the prefiguration of the facts of which they were the witnesses, the precurrent signs of the approach of the last days, of the advent of Antichrist, of the glorious coming of the Saviour by which it was to be followed, of his reign of a thousand years on the renovated earth, of the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment. These grand pictures of the future, which animated the first Christians in their combat of faith, ought, they said, to be constantly present in the meditation of the members of the Church. Accordingly, in certain Protestant conventicles of our age, the explanation of the Apocalypse and of prophets of the Old Testament occupied the principal place. With the aid of a varied supply of allegories, the inspired Bengel, Darby, Cumming, had not much difficulty in finding allusions to contemporaneous events, and specially to those which were held to announce the end of the actual economy. Scarcely is there a year of this century which was not indicated by some preacher as to be the last, and in which some credulous sectaries, such as the adherents of Miller in America, did not make preparations for going forth to meet the Lord. What reason, then, is there for astonishment that these fancies suggested to Joe Smith the idea of making them the auxiliary of his exodus; that among the members of these conventicles, always on the look-out for news of the *Millennium*, "the Latter-Day

Saints" found, and still find, believers who, on the faith of the Mormon Bible, are ready to emigrate for the new American Zion, and young women not unwilling to go to people their harems? Little, under these circumstances, was wanting for the evocation of spirits by means of turning and talking tables becoming a new snare to credulity.

Even the miraculous gifts of the early days of the Church were attempted to be renewed in the early days of this revival. Numerous visionaries, of whom Jung Stilling may be considered the first, asserted that they possessed the power to heal bodily disease by prayer. Irving, the renowned preacher of the Caledonian chapel in London, long implored the gifts of the Holy Spirit for his Church, persuaded that the lack of faith alone prevented disciples from obtaining them. Finally, he had the consolation (1832) of learning that among his disciples in Glasgow there re-appeared the gift of tongues and prophecies, that at his voice young women fell into ecstacy, and in their ravishments seemed to renew the prodigies of the first Pentecost. The Montanist prophetesses of the second century would have furnished a more exact comparison. But what shall we say of the depravation of religious ideas which manifested itself in certain sects issued from pietism, say among the Loesare (Readers) of Sweden (1803), and in the case of that Saxon visionary, whose fanaticism, over excited by some pages of the Bible indiscreetly commented, found its expression in suicide (1846)? What shall we say of those *Inspired Seers* of Germany, disciples of Schönherr and of Stephan, who in their chapels in Dresden and Königsburg renewed the scandals of the Butlerian faction (1830-40); of those Antonians, of those Michelians of the Canton of Berne, who reproduced those of the brothers Kohler? What,

finally, shall we say of the fearful wanderings into which a young peasant girl fell (1823) in the Canton of Zurich, whose spiritual pride, it is said, was intoxicated by the flatteries of Madame Krudener? Certainly nothing could be more unjust, or rather nothing more absurd, than to judge from such examples the persons who were most prominent in the religious revival of our time. These were only sad exceptions, well fitted to illustrate the fact how dangerous it is for the religious sentiment to repel the indispensable guidance of reason and conscience, and how liable to perversion are religious manifestations beyond the control of publicity. While excellent friends of the revival laboured by a more attentive reading of the sacred books, by more animated and impressive preaching, by reforming sacred song, by the dissemination of religious tracts—in a word, by new means of edification, to re-animate piety among Protestants, some theologians thought they should attain the same object by a strict return to the doctrines consigned in the old symbols of the Reformation, from which the churches and the national clergies had insensibly deviated. In the eighteenth century, and at the commencement of this, Protestant orthodoxy had itself felt the necessity of softening its asperities and of accommodating itself, both by concessions and by discreet reticences, to the exigencies of a period when philosophy was still in credit. In the new state of public thought, orthodoxy thought it could shew more self-confidence. Simple minds, urged to renew their bonds with Heaven, accepted without too much examination the doctrines of ancient date, which, by the fact that they were ancient, affirmed themselves with more authority. Many theologians, also, after the great shipwreck in which the faith of nations had appeared ready to sink, thought they could

not ascend too high the current which had carried it away, or fix it on too solid moorings.

In this dogmatic retrogradation they found for auxiliaries the chief dissident bodies who, while separating from the old Churches, had not abjured the creeds of the Reformation, and even took credit for throwing certain forms of religious opinion into relief. Dogmatic fidelity, as it was called, was then the common ground on which the national and dissident orthodox believers threw up their batteries in common. The word of command was to rally and strengthen everywhere the adherents of the ancient theology, to procure for it new supporters among the clergy, to enrol under that banner, to patronize, and, when necessary, to subsidize, young theologians able to defend it, to form associations in which the old doctrine should be regularly preached and taught, in the hope that it would resume the upper hand in the national Churches themselves. Thus organized, thus favoured by the spirit of the moment, the dogmatic reaction declared itself, with more or less force, in all the communities that had issued from the Reformation. If the hierarchy of the middle ages, with its privileges and omnipotence, was the ideal proposed to the Catholic peoples, the theology of the sixteenth century, such specially as it was when stereotyped after the days of the first Reformers, was the ideal set before the Protestant nations. All the pretended progress, they said, accomplished from that date, all the systems advanced in the name of superior reason or a more exact acquaintance with the sacred books, were only a deplorable deviation from the truth; all the objections against the articles reported fundamental ought to be accounted of no value; in the sixteenth century the immovable basis of the evangelical faith had been laid. Apart from that, it was

affirmed, on the authority of certain jurists, there was no legal existence for any Protestant community, no certain marks by which the restored governments might recognize the Churches authorized to treat with them. Not only, then, absolute submission to all the teachings of the Bible ought to be vigorously exacted, but the sense of its words should be firmly observed which the old Protestant symbols authorized.

Such was the law laid down at the anniversary of the Reformation in Germany (1817) by the fiery preacher Klaus Harms, when in his ninety-five theses, as if he were a second Luther, he gave his age a severe lesson, launched out against the papacy of reason, taxed the German people with apostasy, and summoned his colleagues to hasten back to the doctrines of the great Reformer. Gruntvig, in Denmark, held the same language (1826). Similar was the claim made by the Evangelical party in England for the Thirty-nine Articles; in Scotland, by "the moderates," for the Confession of Calvin; in France, by "the Archives of Christianity" (1824), for the Confession of La Rochelle; in Holland, by "the classes of Amsterdam" (1819), for the Belgian Confession and the articles of Dort; in Geneva, by two or three pastors who, in re-editing the second Helvetic Confession, demanded that, recently re-united to Switzerland, Geneva should afresh submit its Church to the authority of that symbol. Moreover, they added, in proposing it for signature to the members of the pastoral body, there was no attempt to constrain conscience; it was not said to them, Believe; but, Do you believe? Only (which was kept in the back-ground) in case of a negative reply, total or partial, the ecclesiastic best qualified for his functions would have to resign, except he preferred being deposed.

While awaiting the re-establishment of these different symbols, their advocates denounced in terms, the violence and injustice of which were blamed by more than one partizan of the old beliefs, the Churches which tolerated another tone of preaching; against them foreign Churches were stirred up; by their side there were founded separate schools and chapels, as so many batteries of assault against their influence. Against such attacks true science, united with enlightened zeal, furnished the surest weapons. It was necessary to frankly accept the struggle on the ground on which it was offered. Far from treating as indifferent for faith the questions made the order of the day, it was necessary to discuss them with calmness, but with all gravity; to oppose to the declarations of the retrogradists a fundamental examination of their doctrines, and an instructive history of those symbols in which so much Roman tradition was mixed with Evangelical teaching. It was necessary, with the aid of a wise exegesis, to combat that unintelligent literalism, which, applying to the questions of the day apostolic words having no relation to them, transformed into slavish doctrines, doctrines of emancipation. It was also necessary, with the aid of a sound criticism, to define the real authority of the Bible; to unmask that doctrine of plenary inspiration which shewed itself so respectful toward it only to elude or to twist the clearest texts; to execute justice on all those petty papacies which installed themselves under the shelter of its infallible authority; moreover, to leave to those who had been thus refuted full liberty of discussion; to impose no obstacle to their meetings, their discourses, their publications; relying on its own solid right and on the power of truth frankly professed. But disciplinary measures are a weapon more convenient in appearance, the employment of which eccle-

siastical bodies renounce with difficulty. In Geneva, the fear of schism caused young theologians to be forbidden to attend separatist assemblies (1813), and limited for all parties the discussion in the pulpit of controverted subjects (1817). These regulations, which were properly abolished afterwards, although less tyrannical than the re-establishment of the Confessions of Faith would have been, were specially less so than the measures of coercion decreed by the State against nonconforming assemblies. In Prussia, in Scandinavia, in Würtemburg, in divers cantons of Switzerland, where those measures were particularly rigorous, far from producing the intended effect, they only gave more strength and vigour to dissent. Meetings dissolved by force had only greater attraction for souls agitated by religious wants. Even benignant steps easily passed for persecution. Deposed ministers, if only on account of the noise they made, obtained over the minds of laymen credit all the greater, the stronger their convictions appeared, the more austere their piety, and their repute of having suffered for the truth.

Then, in the degree in which the democratic tendencies of our age became more decided, when the radical or socialist publications, the increase of secret societies, finally fresh revolutions, came to threaten social superiorities—first the governments, then the privileged classes, afterwards the opulent, finally simple citizens—in a word, all that had anything to lose, any position to preserve, took into favour, even without personally adhering to them, doctrines which were presented to them as the sole guarantees of social order. It was not only in the Catholic world that the terrors of the powerful and the fortunate of the age were turned to account on behalf of the dogmas of the past. According to Klaus Harms, Bilderdyck, Hengsten-

berg, Stahl, Krummacher, and many others, it was the moment when orthodox dogmas had been shaken, when the individual judgment took to controlling the articles of belief, that the spirit of subordination had disappeared, and the covetous and factious passions were unchained. What theology was capable of arresting their career, and in bringing back the disowned authority, if not that which imposes silence on reason, and humiliates human pride before an infallible word?

Not only by thus courting wealth and power, but at Geneva, for example, by courting the revolution when it could serve to demolish a rival church or school, did retrograde orthodoxy pursue its way. Certain ecclesiastical foundations which might tempt the people were pointed out to its eye (1847), or, under the veil of the anonymous, borrowing the democratic phraseology, "the free constitution of the religious republic" was claimed by setting in opposition what was called "The People's Church" to "The Church of the Clergy;" intending at a later day to pacify allies alarmed at such maxims by explaining that the *believing* people were meant, and by flattering afresh conservative interests in the statement that Church questions were but secondary to "the great dogmas on the maintenance of which depended personal safety and the safety of families and states." Many people allowed themselves to be taken by this language. Here is a prince who seriously thought that he strengthened his throne by calling the eulogists of the past to ecclesiastical and even civil dignities. Religious doctrines were no longer judged according to their intrinsic truth, but their momentary utility, their political or social convenience. "The Pope is infallible," said Joseph de Maistre, "for it is necessary to society that he should be so." Certain Protestants fol-

lowed the example to demonstrate the infallibility of the whole contents of the Bible. Here is an individual whom the revolutions had set aside from public functions, called to an active part in the religious world, acted there under the sole assumption of the need of authority, and without ever thoroughly examining, if he examined at all, the doctrines under discussion, believed that by asserting these and scorning those, by denying the spirit of free inquiry, and by encouraging with his credit or his purse the exclusive profession of the old dogmas, he contributed to arrest the tumultuous movement of the age. "Reaction of bad alloy," observes M. de Remusat, "inspired by fear or by interest, residing in the head and not in the heart, and which sinks none of the preceding worldliness." "Worldliness returned!" exclaimed Vinet in the same sense. As early as 1820 and 1821, seditions rendered the progressive doctrines suspected by the Protestant governments. The Revolution of 1830, its reverberations which it had in Switzerland and in the rest of Europe, the socialist movements with which it was accompanied, in alarming the higher class of citizens, increased the influence of orthodoxy. The same year (1831) which saw so many new monastic institutions founded in Bavaria and elsewhere, saw evangelical societies founded at Geneva and Paris, from one of which proceeded a new school of theology which took for programme an entire conformity with the Helvetic Confession. In 1835 arose the central Society of Bordeaux, directed in the same spirit; in 1842, that of "the General Interests of French Protestantism," which, if the consistories had agreed, would have charged itself with promoting its influence under the direction of an exclusively orthodox committee. It became fashionable to take part in the new movement of minds.

This aristocratic position of the new revival, as it was called, at Geneva, in the Evangelical assembly of 1861, this new direction of opinion in the elevated or opulent classes, a direction soon followed by those who for divers reasons desired to draw near to them, then by the dependent classes who sought their patronage, could not fail to find favour among the national clergy, who at first had shewn themselves less disposed to them. It was felt desirable to put a stop to this increasing desertion by unfolding a flag which should everywhere regain favour, to take part in the retrograde movement which could not be arrested, and which had high influences on its side. Not content then to remove (that which was only justice for all) the hindrances previously put in the way of dissident assemblies and preaching, they imposed on themselves obstacles, suspicion was thrown on inquiry and science, and the *status quo* was decreed. Henceforth it was against the friends of progress that distrust was turned; then came a struggle with the partizans of the past in rigour and dogmatic intolerance. "All the Bible and nothing but the Bible" became the cry, together with the advocacy of plenary inspiration. Candidates, whose blind docility guaranteed security, were put forward for the ecclesiastical ministry, while others were turned aside by engagements which excluded all liberty of thought. Wherever it was safe, the confessions of faith were re-established; otherwheres the same end was sought, now by examinations of conscience, now by official catechisms, now by liturgies dressed up in an orthodox sense, the textual reading of which was made obligatory, by giving to them that value of personal declarations of faith which they had not before. From Pietism and Methodism they borrowed their dogmatic hymnology. "The Evangelical Alliance," imported from England and

Scotland, served to league the orthodox and national dissidents against the progressive theologians.

In France particularly, as a consequence of the events of 1848, advantage was taken of the emotion caused by daring publications to bring against old pastors, who had expressly combatted the principles, accusations of heresy, which were followed by depositions; to others, chairs, to which they had full right, were refused; while to others again, assistant ministers were refused, though made necessary by protracted services. Finally, in the re-establishment of the old synodal government of the Churches of France, a means was found of keeping out of the ministry candidates imbued with the principles of the modern theology. In the first session, opened in June, 1872, the orthodox majority, after having in a declaration historically expressed what it held to be "the actual faith of the Church," was not long in transforming it into a confession of faith, to be required, before induction, from every candidate for the ministry; moreover, it added to the electoral conditions fixed by the law a dogmatic profession; and in its haste to apply these measures, it demanded from the Government the ratification of them without delay, independently of the other resolutions of the synod. Supposing the immediate object that orthodoxy proposed attained by these acts, the future will teach how far they will contribute to raise the pastoral character and influence, and to unite and vivify the Reformed Church of France.

In Germany, also, the spirit of free inquiry was an object of active hostility. "The Evangelical Gazette" of Berlin, founded under the auspices of the feudal party, ceaselessly harassed, as suspected in both a political and religious point of view, all theologians inculpated of rationalism. Wegscheider and Gesenius, the first de-

nounced, would not have preserved their academical posts at Halle but for the equitable intervention of Neander. Many others, including Schleiermacher himself, were exposed to the same attacks. The furious Gazette solicited and welcomed from all parts of the Protestant world similar denunciations, without even avoiding the meanness of anonymous communications. The popularity gained by Dr. Strauss, and by the appearance of the party styled "the Annalists of Halle," was cleverly worked against independent theologians. The reign of Frederic William IV. especially opened a full career to the zeal of informers. Under that pusillanimous prince, who took revenge on religious liberalism for the anxieties caused to him by the revolution of 1849, a troublesome oppression weighed on consciences. Without a profession of orthodoxy, attested when required by a dogmatical examination before the Minister of Worship, there was no means of getting possession of any ecclesiastical and academic chair. Young theologians, ambitious of success, crowded to the lectures of Hengstenberg; while aged pastors were rudely set aside for having protested against the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed, refused to exorcise in baptism, or uttered doubts on some miracle of the Bible. It was the time when the names dearest to Germany, those of Herder, Kant, Lessing, Schiller, Humboldt, were disgraced in the name of sound doctrine; when the jurist Stahl, armed with his theory of "the Christian State," outlawed whoever did not adopt the dogmas in credit at Court; and when the most faithful friends of the Monarch complained of "the hypocritical obscuration which, proceeding from the Cabinet of his Ministers, invaded the whole of Prussia."

But the return to the dogmas professed in common by the old Protestant parties no longer sufficed for the rigid

Lutherans; Luther himself—the Luther of Worms, of the Wartburg—was not orthodox in their eyes. They must have the Luther of 1525 worried to death by the Sacramentists, who retained in their worship the most of the Catholic elements they could, and for whom the Real Presence of the Body of Christ in the Supper had become a fundamental article of religion. With these strict Lutherans, Zwingli was not more than an unbeliever, whose "doctrine," said Stahl, "went to the entire annihilation of Christianity." As early as 1817, when the King of Prussia, by measures somewhat precipitate, wished to unite the two Protestant communions of his realm, they violently opposed the project. They profited by the reaction of 1849 to fortify their position in face of the Reformed Churches, as well as of those in which the union had been effected, and to secure the domination of their party wherever they could. The "Evangelical Gazette" of Berlin itself, abjuring its old sympathies, characterized as apostasy the appeal of Calvinist theologians to the Evangelical Assembly of 1857. In the provinces where the union was rejected, Saxony, Bavaria, especially Hanover and Mecklenburg, Lutheranism assumed more decided forms. A return was openly made to the formulas of the sixteenth and seventeeth centuries. What were called "the faithful pastors," as in our days the bishops of Germany, became the supreme judges of the teaching of the universities. In dogma and in worship, the points on which Lutheranism distinguished itself most from the other Protestant confessions, were those which they undertook to throw most into prominence. With those "Hyperlutherians," everything was referred to the Church, to the visible Church, recruited by baptism. Christianity was nothing without that Church; nothing without the sacraments, invested

with a kind of magical virtue; nothing, consequently, without the priesthood, who, drawing its privileges from the rite of ordination, alone gave the sacraments their efficacy, conferred the Holy Spirit by confirmation, the forgiveness of sins by the absolution pronounced at the sacred table. In divine service, preaching was but an accessory; the altar was set up at the cost of the pulpit; even in Berlin, and in the churches of the nobility, purely liturgical services were instituted, in which the psalms were chanted on the knees. The holy Supper, almost assimilated to the Mass, might be celebrated without attendants. In short, approximations, ever increasing, were made to Catholic forms and tendencies. Neither Hengstenberg, nor Leo, nor Stahl, nor the Court itself, any longer disguised the sympathies by which they were drawn in that direction. In concert with the Ultramontanes, they protested against lay instruction and civil marriage. There was in Erfurt an assembly in which was expressed a desire that "the Protestants and the Roman Catholics should give each other their hand as a pledge that they would withstand the revolution and anti-Christianity;" so eager were they to strengthen society in its bases by planting in Protestantism itself the absolute principle of authority. The *Syllabus*, proclaimed at Rome, and immediately turned to account by the enemies of Germanic unity, came at the right moment to arrest on that incline the Protestant Church of Germany, and to discover to it the abyss whither it was being led.

In the Anglican Church, by the very fact of its origin and of its primitive institutions, the movement of hierarchical and ritualistic restoration was destined to be more precocious and specially more tenacious. Queen Elizabeth, in maintaining the Thirty-nine Articles drawn up under

Edward VI., had preserved all the Catholic forms of government and worship that she could. The co-existence of elements so disparate had not delayed to give birth in the Anglican Church to two parties, of which one, attached to the confession of faith, inclined in consequence to Puritanism; while the other, attached to the liturgy and episcopal authority, made the Roman Catholic element predominate in Anglicanism. Nevertheless, united under the common law of the State, they insensibly approached to, if they did not blend with, each other. The retrograde movement of our age, in carrying each of the parties back to its point of departure, made their contrasts come forth afresh. While the first, known under the name of "the Evangelical party," made it its aim to revive the rigour of the dogmas of Calvin,—the second, insisting on the value of tradition, revived the credit of the study of the ancient Fathers, and that of ecclesiastical archæology, while it specially laboured to restore to public worship its attractions by perfecting music and sacred architecture. Its efforts, still imprinted with wisdom and moderation, assumed from the date of the parliamentary ecclesiastical decrees of 1833, a direction more determinate and less pacific.

When it saw that, with the aid of the Evangelical party and with that of the Dissenters recently admitted into Parliament, the moiety of the bishops was suppressed in Ireland, changes were proposed in the Liturgy, and other more decisive measures announced in the future, it seriously took alarm. Grouped around Drs. Pusey and Newman, two distinguished Professors of the University of Oxford, it resolved to enlighten the English public on the dangers which threatened the Church, and to throw into relief the principles and institutions which served as its foundation.

This was the object of ninety essays which appeared under the title of "Tracts for the Times" (1833-4). The incompetence of the civil government in ecclesiastical matters; the authority of ancient Tradition maintained by the side of that of Scripture; the Liturgy, which was its expression, an indispensable element, consequently, for the explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles; divine grace attached to the sacraments; their exclusive administration by a priesthood which could prove its legitimate succession from the apostles; the regenerative virtue of baptism; the body and blood of Christ really present in the Supper, and offered to God by the priests as a sacrifice of reconciliation; the obligatory observance of the saints' days; that of fasting on Friday; frequent communion; finally, of all the ancient rites that had been allowed to fall into disuse—such were the principles on which the "Puseyite" party insisted in those Tracts, whence it took the name of "Tractarian." In advancing so far in the Catholic direction, consistent minds felt it difficult not to proceed to the end. Pusey, it is true, stopped in time; but Newman (1843) took the final step, drawing after him, by the prestige of Catholic authority and pomp, several hundred of his disciples, students in Oxford, members of the clergy, nobles of England and Scotland. The scandal caused by these defections, and certain equivocal declarations which were added thereto, stopped the progress of Catholicism for a moment, but without delaying the advance of moderate Ritualism or "Puseyism." The latter, it is said, counts to-day among its followers nearly a third of the members of the Anglican clergy, who, flattering the taste of a certain part of the flock, re-introduced emulously into their parishes, wax candles, holy water, the crucifix, the elevation of the Host, public processions, penance, spiritual direction, and even

the claustral life, not without danger of inveiglements to the detriment of opulent families. Is it solely for the love of discipline that a petition of five hundred English ecclesiastics lately demanded (1873) the restoration of "auricular confession" in their parishes? Let us add that in 1865, by the organ of Dr. Pusey, an alliance was seriously proposed between the English Church, the Greek Church, and the Latin Church, by the adoption of a common ritual, liberty of monastic associations, and of the institution of General Councils, under the presidency of the Bishop of Rome. This programme of the Ritualist or Anglo-Catholic party, which has been acceded to by most of the bishops, the leader of the Evangelical party brought before Parliament in a Bill supported by numerous petitions. Moreover, without proceeding to these extremes, many Protestant doctors unconsciously allowed themselves to be drawn on to the same descent. They seem to envy the Roman clergy that which gives them so much empire over souls, the right to confess, that of absolving, especially that privilege of unquestionable authority which puts away at once all objections, and, by allowing you to command, removes the trouble of persuading and convincing. Have we not finally seen certain "Evangelical Committees," in drawing up their formularies, leave in the shade dogmas characteristic of the Reformation, and in preference put forward, in order to oppose Liberalism, those which brought them near the Catholic faith, especially that of the Trinity, as if all the Christian formulas had become indifferent with them, provided they served to close the way of progress?

But nothing better attests the force of this retrograde movement in the Christian communions of the West than the attitude which it has made certain philosophical schools

momentarily to assume. In the middle ages Philosophy acknowledged itself the humble servant of Theology. In our days, doubtless it has not gone so far back as that. But we have seen several of those who down till then cultivated it freely and according to their own impulses, gradually incline their meditations, their methods, their language, in the direction of what suited the favourite ecclesiastical parties; resuscitate to the benefit of religious authority the philosophical scepticism of Huet and Pascal; count for nothing the arguments drawn from observation and experience; find everywhere antinomies which weakened the legitimate deductions of reason; refuse themselves the right to believe in God on the natural proofs which Paul adduces with confidence; and, as philosophers nevertheless could not decently deny the science which they professed, adapt it at least to the taste of the day by putting it at the service of a theology that had fallen into the rear. You saw them, as the Neo-platonics of old, puzzle their brains to find profound senses, metaphysical necessities for the most simple conceptions of former ages; while others, to lead the religious public to like systems the naked exposition of which would have caused scandal, clothe them in terms borrowed from the accredited vocabulary. By this feature you will recognize the leaders of "the Speculative School" which reigned in Germany in the first half of this century. Down to 1803, Schelling, it is said, had not dreamt of comprising Christianity in his system; free from all religious pre-occupation, he had constructed his "Philosophy of Nature" abstractly. But his century, having become Christian again, asks of him what he does with Christianity. Schelling does not hesitate. Christ is "one of the evolutions of the Deity, manifesting itself in humanity, as formerly He had

manifested Himself in nature, God appearing in the finite to bring it back to the infinite, from which it had separated. Hegel follows in his master's footsteps. After speaking magnificently of religion, as of "the region in which are resolved all the enigmas of life and the contradictions of thought, and in which the gifts of sentiment are stilled," he unhesitatingly declares its identity with philosophy; their common source, he says, is the God-man, the Word made flesh. Then there appear in his system, as in that of Schelling, all the dogmas dear to orthodoxy. The Trinity, the incarnation of the Word, the fall of man, the origin of physical and moral evil, the redemption, the miraculous birth, death, the resurrection of the God-man, expiation by his blood, occupied so large a place in speculative philosophy, that Lutheran orthodoxy thought itself returned to the fine days of its domination, and congratulated itself on finding, against the neologism of the preceding century, auxiliaries so valuable. In truth, we must not look too closely into the matter. The words employed in common had not the same sense on both sides. In explaining himself on the Trinity, Schelling taught that "God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—was the absolute, the root and substance of all things, objectivating itself in the world to contemplate Himself there, and hence to acquire consciousness of Himself;" or, according to Hegel's definition, God in Himself, God for Himself, God in and for Himself, returns in the Holy Spirit to His primitive identity. The world, separated from the substance of God, found itself lost; that loss required a redemption, for which God must make Himself man; but this was an ideal incarnation, designating the eternal union of humanity with divinity. God born, suffering, rising again, were the successive phases of the process or development of the absolute, the crises in

the midst of which they were accomplished; so that after all there is no personal God, and for man no liberty, nor personal immortality; but solely the great whole, in which beings that had only the appearance of individuality were to lose themselves as drops of water in the ocean. In short, the system was full of Pantheistic idealism; but the phraseology was orthodox, and that sufficed for a great number of theologians: to speak their language was a homage paid to their credit—a proof of the value that was attached to their suffrage. Hegel, moreover, a conservative in politics, had introduced into history a system of philosophic fatalism much relished by absolute governments of the day. Whatever is, he said, has its reason for being, and thereby is founded in right; so that the existing monarchies, as well as the theological symbols in vigour, thought they had found in Hegel the most faithful ally. There was a time when, in the Court of Prussia, they in some sort swore only by him; when by his influence he appointed ministers of State, pastors for the Church, professors of theology in the Universities. We shall see otherwheres what became of this eccentric alliance between a philosophy which consented to travesty itself in order to escape from insulation, and a theology which accounted that compliment an honour.

If we could follow the movements of the Russian Church, as we have followed the movements of the Churches of the West, we should, under the influence of the same political crises, meet with general facts analogous in character; a period of revival promptly followed by a movement of retrocession.

Consternated by the capture of Moscow, which had put the empire of the Czars within two inches of its ruin, but soon reassured by the disastrous retreat of the French

army (1812), Alexander I. lent an ear to the pious exhortations of some Moravian sectaries, who had represented to him these events as miraculously directed by Providence and announced in sacred Scripture itself. "The conflagration of Moscow," he said, "has thrown light into my soul." One of his first acts was the foundation of the Bible Society of Petersburg. The Russian court and nobility shared his enthusiasm for that work. He took under his protection the missionaries who evangelized the Pagans and Moslems of his states. He took pains to extend among his Christian subjects solid religious instruction. Finally, to him and to his pietistic counsellors has been ascribed the text of the celebrated treaty in which the three allied Sovereigns, meeting in Paris after their victory, undertook, in the name of the Holy Trinity, to "take Christian teachings for the sole rule of their policy, and in concert to govern their people as a single Christian family." But soon a more selfish and worldly policy got the upper hand in Petersburg, as well as in Vienna and Berlin. The liberal ideas with which Alexander for some time shewed himself imbued, when he knew that they were propagated in the lodges of Freemasons, began to appear to him threatening for his authority; the Bible Society, already little relished by the Russian clergy as an importation from abroad, began to be less in favour with the monarch himself; the popular movements of 1820-21 completed the dissipation of his illusions; all his efforts, as those of the sovereigns his allies, turned henceforwards toward the suppression of the new ideas.

Nicholas I., his successor, still more opposed to every thing that could compromise his repose and that of the state (1825), signalized his reign by an absolute religious reformation conformed to the exigencies of his policy. One

sole faith, one sole nation, one sole monarch—these three interests were identified in the mind of the Czar. The strict union of the State with the Russian Church, the exclusive preponderance of the latter became in his eyes the firmest support of the national unity. The revival in the beginning of the century had set the old sects in movement, and they then counted about five millions of adherents. The zeal of the Rascolnikes had revived under the form of absolute separatism, which here and there was not a little fierce. Nicholas resolved to subdue it at any cost, forced the children of those sectaries to be baptized by the priests, transported their parents by thousands into the convents of Siberia or to the mountains of the Caucasus, while the ecclesiastics and the civil functionaries of the empire exercised on others a thousand extortions. On the urgencies of his clergy, he suppressed the Bible Society (1826) founded by Alexander, and sent away the Bâle missionaries who refused to introduce their proselytes into the Greek communion. In the national church itself, all progress of science, all movement of thought, coming from the West, was an object of suspicion with him. Three doctors in theology were all that existed in his dominions in 1836. In a word, the Russian Church fell back into the torpor whence Alexander I. had for a moment sought to lift it. A new reign was necessary to call forth in it any life.

III.

RETURN OF THE CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE CIVIL AND THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

A MOVEMENT of religious restoration, such as that whose history we have just sketched, by reviving in the ecclesiastical bodies old pretensions, old and ambitious hopes, could not fail to raise between them and the governments conflicts of authority more or less threatening to peace. Of these we must now give an account. In Russia, in truth, those conflicts were less to be feared than elsewhere. On the part of married priests, whose interests, closely allied with those of the nation, were protected by the government as those of the nation itself, the civil order did not run the risk of very dangerous collisions. In all times the Greek clergy had docilely recognized the authority of the Sovereign. The Czars, moreover, had maintained order. In emancipating the Russian Church from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and then from that of Moscow, they had subjected it to the Holy Synod, whose members were for the most part appointed by them, and presided over by an imperial officer; they had also reserved to themselves the choice of the bishops; they had restricted the number and the privileges of the convents, subjected to taxation ecclesiastical property, and reduced the clergy to the rank of officers salaried by the State. On another side, content to watch them from without in such a way as to repress in them every act threatening their authority, they avoided trespassing on the ecclesiastical domain properly so called, interposed only in matters of mixed

interest, took no part in those of worship, particularly in those of dogma; for them the orthodox creed of 1642 was the sacred ark which they carefully abstained from touching; their Czar-papacy, in a word, much less extreme, much more discreet than that of the ancient Greek emperors, revolted consciences less, and raised on the part of the clergy much less opposition.

In the Catholic States, the mutual relations of the governments and the clergy could not be of a nature so habitually pacific. Placed by celibacy on the outside of civil society, directed by other principles, pursuing other interests; subject to a chief in whom they say exists the representative of God Himself; finding, finally, in the past toward which they saw themselves drawn, traditions which flattered their ambition, they easily resumed their old attitude of domineering in regard to the State; the more, in consequence, the official bonds between the civil order and the religious were tightened, the more did conflicts between them become inevitable.

Bonaparte and Pius VII. had the first experience in the matter. Scarcely had the Concordat of 1801 been signed, scarcely had the laudations of "the new Cyrus" (as he was called) echoed in the churches of France and Italy, than the discharge of shots was heard from one side and the other. Pius VII. desired that the protection that resulted from their alliance should extend to the Catholic worship alone; that marriage, considered as a sacrament, should be valid only under the priest's benediction; that divorce, forbidden by the ecclesiastical law, should be equally forbidden by the civil law; that the relations of the French clergy with their spiritual Head should be maintained absolutely free; and that the supervision of public education should be wholly theirs. The First Consul, on his part,

instructed by history and the advice of his lawyers of the pretensions which an independent religious authority had never failed to raise against the civil order, judged it prudent to trace boundary-lines which they were not to go beyond, even in the religious order. The articles of the Concordat of 1801 were not published, except with the complement of the organic articles of 1802, which declared obligatory in the seminaries the teaching of the maxims which secured what were called "the Gallican Liberties," maintained the right of appeal against abuses, made clerics answerable for alleged misconduct to civil tribunals, required the *placet* (or civil sanction) for the bulls of the Pope and directions of the bishops, &c. All the protests of Pius VII. were nugatory, all the hopes of modifications which were held out to him as the price of his services were disappointed. The Catechism of the Empire, subscribed by the minister of religion, placed in the first rank of Christian duties, as a direct consequence of obedience toward God, absolute obedience to the Empire. The decree on the University, which gave to that body the supreme direction of the public instruction, had for result the nullification of the influence of the clergy in this domain.

Then soon came the exigencies occasioned by the complications of the European war, and Pius VII. learnt that he was expected to be an instrument much more than an ally. It was signified to him, as a vassal of the Empire, that he was to introduce the French code of laws into his dominions, to acknowledge the French princes invested with sovereignty in Italy, to close his ports to the enemies of France; then, at the first sign of disobedience to these orders, he found himself stript of his principality, and in punishment for his Bull of Excomunication he was personally trans-

ported as a captive to Savona, as his predecessor had been to Valentia. But his revenge was ready; for neither in the Concordat, nor even in the organic articles, had Napoleon provided for everything. In charging the Pope with the canonical institution of the bishops named by the Emperor, he had forgotten to fix the term within which the institution was obligatory, and the measures to be taken in case of its refusal. This omission was adroitly worked. As early as the first nominations, Pius VII., required to institute the new bishops, replies, that being no longer free he cannot perform any valid act. Among the vicars-general charged with the *interim*, some refused to officiate, others are not recognized; the dioceses protest, the provinces murmur, the ordinary members of the Church agitate; it becomes necessary to think of means for legally doing without the Papal institution. Here, then, we behold Napoleon, in the midst of his colossal enterprizes, held in check by an old man in captivity; behold the successful warrior engaged with his jurisconsults and theologians in all the intricacies of the canonical law, having recourse to trickery and force which turn against himself, reduced to deplore the Concordat "as the greatest fault of his reign," and expiating in Spain by the sufferings of his army, decimated by the poison and poignard of the monks and the *trabuco* (musket) of the guerillas, his acts of violence against the Pontiff. Finally, when by terrifying the bishops he found in Paris a council docile to his orders, and at Fontainbleau compelled the Pope to sign the conciliatory decree which was to disarm him, the European powers, now masters of Paris, force the Emperor to abdicate, when the prisoner escapes and the gaoler in his turn becomes the captive and the exile. Will the delivered Church and legitimate Royalty, restored and united together by common interests and an

alliance which promises to be perpetual, live together in peace? By no means. The Church of France, supported at Court by a bigoted faction, supported in the Chambers by a nobility which relies on it for aid to recover its property and privileges, supported in the rural districts by the ignorance of the populations, takes a high tone with the State; it is the Church that commands, the Church that exacts, the Church that will bear no chain, the Church which demands to communicate directly with the Pope, and which claims, with the entire freedom of its own teachings, the restriction of the lay instruction, which it treats as impious and atheistic; finally, it is the Church that declares through its bishops, that above the power of Kings soars the divine authority of the Pope, adding, by the voice of Leo XII. himself, that "the Head of the Church possesses with full right at least an indirect authority over all states" (1825). But how are these pretensions reconciled with the Concordat and the Charter? And if the Royal authority subscribes to them, into what discredit will it fall? To alienate the clergy, on which it rests, as against the citizens; to incur the contempt of the citizens by yielding to the clergy—such are the rocks on which the dynasty of the Bourbons will make shipwreck. On one side, Montlosier reproaches it with serfdom to the authority of Rome; on another, Lamennais accuses it of detaching itself from the centre of Catholicity. Now the Royal Courts, following the example of the Parliaments of old, assume, by appeals against abuses, to dispose of the sacraments and benedictions of the Church; now the bishops set their seminaries free from the superintendence of the university, and transform them into colleges of Jesuits for the instruction of the children of the nobility. In 1828, under the ministry of Martignac, the Chamber of Peers closes eight of these

seminaries, and forbids all members of unauthorized societies to teach. In 1830, under the ministry of Polignac, the clergy resume the upper-hand, and recommend to the King the fatal "ordinances." And under each of the new governments which succeed each other, scarcely has the alliance between the two powers been renewed, but, under the favour of public opinion, you see a revival more or less disguised of the pretensions of the Church to direct the State, or to withdraw itself from the just rights which the latter had reserved. To-day it is the preponderance of the clergy in regard to public instruction that is asserted against the Constituent Assembly; to-morrow it is the privilege of appointing the bishops which, by a word thrown out as if by hazard, the Sacred See attempts to transform for the State into a simple right of presentation; or, again, it is the re-establishment of the throne of the Bourbons, plotted by the Pope and the clergy in union with the Legitimists.

In general, in our age, the constant aim of the Roman Church has in all countries been to obtain, with the entire and exclusive protection of the temporal power, the most complete independence in the spiritual order, to secure the support of the State while refusing all guarantees.

Such was the programme of the German bishops assembled in 1848 at Würzburg; such was the principle proclaimed in the Encyclic of Pius IX., and which the Italian bishops set forth in opposition to the measures of the Minister of State, Ricasoli. "What!" they said to him, "the Catholic Church is free in Protestant America, and in Catholic countries she is not to be free?" "Yes," replied the statesman; "in America she is free because she foregoes the support of the State; do you forego it, and you will be equally free. A free Church? Yes; but in a free State, as Cavour desired." This was the view which,

since 1830, Lamennais himself upheld. Down till then sacerdotal pride had revolted in him against the shackles which governments aimed to impose on the Church. "We will let them see," he then said, "what a priest is." And with a view of throwing off those shackles, it was nothing less than a theocracy that he contemplated for France. The revolution of 1830 suggested other thoughts to him. He acknowledged that, in order not to depend on the State, the Church must owe nothing to the State, and henceforth it was on liberty that he attempted to found the Church. But when he saw liberty anathematized in Rome (1834), and the Church, at the feet of princes, purchase afresh the stable at the price of the yoke, then he shook off the dust of his feet against the Church, and from being a priest became an agitator. With a little more perspicacity, his friends need not to have watched till then to discern the future agitator under the gown of the priest.

In Spain, still more than in France, the ecclesiastical power had the preponderance, and it was only by *coups d'etat* that from time to time the civil authority succeeded in asserting its rights. When the treasury was empty and the army ready to revolt, the convents were bled; but soon was it necessary to stop the operation before a populace stirred up by the monks to regain peace with Rome by acts of submission; to expiate by the restitutions of 1845 and the Concordat of 1851 the spoliations of 1834-37; to suspend in '56 those of '55; finally, under a Queen who needed forgiveness so largely, to submit to the hateful ascendancy of a confessor and of an intriguing nun, until a new revolution seemed necessary to rescue the kingdom from so degrading a yoke (1868). The position of Protestant governments in regard to the Catholic clergy was not without its difficulties. In receiving in 1815 annexa-

tions of territory which brought with them Catholic inhabitants, they had to undertake to maintain the advantages which those annexations had previously enjoyed, while on their part they reserved certain guarantees. These accommodations, in their nature thorny, frequently gave occasion to new disagreements. The collective Concordat proposed at Frankfort in 1818 by some states of Germany, had to be indefinitely adjourned. The transactions with Prussia had been more easy, thanks to the condescendence of that power, whom the Holy See could not then praise sufficiently. While, in 1821, the King bound himself by express engagements, the Pope, who thought his dignity compromised by Concordats with Protestants, bound himself only by letters more or less vague. Hence arose between them the grave and interminable conflicts on the subject of mixed marriages. During some time in Prussia, the validity of those marriages had been tacitly recognized by the Catholic Church itself (1830) by means of the mere *passive* presence of the priest during the performance of the ceremony by the Protestant minister. All of a sudden (1835) the new Archbishop of Cologne, Droste von Vischering, who in his election had promised to maintain the existing arrangement, begins to play false as to the import of the Papal Brief. He declares null in his diocese all mixed marriages in which the wedded couples had not undertaken to bring up their children in the Catholic religion. In this case, the Prussian Government had a very simple means for protecting the rights of its subjects; it was to make, as in France, the validity of the marriage in the eyes of the law independent of the religious ceremony. But, owing to the old customs of the country, reinforced by the new theory of "the Christian State," the civil registers throughout Germany were still in the

hands of the ministers of religion. Instead of a wise law, Frederick William III. had recourse to constraint; the recalcitrant bishop was imprisoned. But this Napoleonic method of acting had little success; the prelate, hitherto hated by his flock, was henceforward venerated as a martyr; the opposition of which he had set the example spread over the oriental provinces; the arrest of the Archbishop of Posen for the same cause aggravated the conflict, which the Monarch terminated only by a new act of weakness. He established in the Ministry of Religion an exclusively Catholic department, which more than ever enabled the Church to dictate laws to the State.

But the Church, always ready to abuse testimonies of deference, had, under firmer hands, to learn the limits of its authority. Gregory XVI., who in his Bulls of 1832-34 had appeared to sustain the cause of Kings as much as that of the Church, obtained from them efficacious measures against its adversaries. Pius IX., less prudent, while proclaiming by the Vatican Council his universal supremacy in political matters as well as religious, has obliged governments to put themselves in a state of defence against him. In his earliest attempts at encroachment, those of Germany reminded him that the times were changed, and that in passing beyond his bounds he compelled them to pass beyond theirs. To the political machinations of the bishops and the Jesuits, they opposed a series of measures destined to suppress their religious influence. Not only they maintained in their functions the educators and the ecclesiastics unjustly deposed by their negation of the Syllabus; not only they confirmed the rights of the State in the nomination of the priests and bishops, whose salaries they pay, and transferred to the civil authority the supreme direction of lay instruction; but they also conferred on it a

right of supervision over the preaching, of inspection over the instructions of the religious seminaries and schools, bound young ecclesiastics to undergo the university examinations, but finally suppressed, as an instrument of division and agitation, the order of the Jesuits and all who are affiliated with them. Thus somewhat rudely expelled from Germany, those soldiers of the Pope have taken refuge in England, where the Archbishop of Westminster (Dr. Manning) is arranging to found for them, out of the contributions of the newly converted, a university and colleges exclusively Catholic.

In Switzerland also, the enterprizes of the Ultramontane clergy have called on the civil governments to take against them precautions of the same nature. As a consequence of intrigues carried on for nearly half a century, the Papacy, in contempt of express conventions, thought itself able to detach the Catholic Church of Geneva from the diocese of Fribourg and Lausanne, and to create and establish in it, under the title of Apostolic Vicar, an independent bishop, invested with the most extensive authority. What a seductive prospect for the Bishop of Rome thus to place Geneva again under the cross of a resident bishop! The ambitious priest for whose advantage this manœuvre was executed, and who employed himself ardently in the undertaking, was deposed and conducted out of the Swiss territory by order of the Confederation; the religious corporations which acted as his auxiliaries were suppressed; popular instruction was placed under the supervision of the State; finally, by a new constitutional law, in which one regrets to see a formal oath which all priests must take, the old as well as the new, the ecclesiastical functions, which, at the Pope's order, the Bishop of Fribourg refused to exercise, are handed over to the Catholic community itself. In the

diocese of Bâle, when the bishop undertook to exact from his priests, under pain of deposition, obedience to the new dogma decreed by Rome, five cantons of the diocese protested against the attempt, upheld in their functions the priests faithful to their conscience and dear to their flocks, and finally declared, each in what concerned it, the prelate stript of his episcopal authority; the canton of Berne, still more rigorous, deposed the priests who, by the public and unauthorized reading in public of the bishop's mandate, had broken the laws of the State. It is probable that in the greater part of Switzerland, while waiting for the separation of Church and State, a democratic form of government imposed on the national clergy by the Catholic people themselves, will put a bridle on their abuses of authority, and that, by being obstinate to support the Roman despotism, it will have to submit to popular control, and introduce into its constitution changes which it has hitherto repelled. Already, owing to the communal form of government, the nomination of the priests by the parishes begins to gain favour in the principal cantons. The offensive terms made use of by the Pope to discredit these different measures, have led to the suppression of the Roman Nunciature in Switzerland (1873), which had long been a piece of useless, if not dangerous, machinery.

If the Court of Rome, relying on its ancient traditions, thought itself authorized to impose laws on political powers, Protestant governments, on their side, took authority from past events to assume a high hand against the churches of their states. Accordingly, without much trouble in Switzerland since 1830, they, on different occasions, changed the ecclesiastical constitutions with the concurrence of the people and in a popular direction. But when they wished to interfere in too direct a manner in the administration of

spiritual interests, the spirit of religious reaction sometimes threw unexpected difficulties in their way. We have already alluded to those which the German princes had to encounter in their attempts to bring about a union of the Lutheran and Reformed communities. The Kings of Prussia, Reformed princes ruling over populations of which the majority was Lutheran, attached to that union more importance than all the others. Nothing, moreover, appeared to them more easy, at a moment when Lutheran and Reformed Churches were preparing to celebrate (1817), with common accord, at once the deliverance of their native Germany and the third centenary of its successful Reformation. After a paternal invitation addressed to his subjects of the two communions, Frederick William III. charges a commission with the office of drawing up a form of Liturgy and ecclesiastical constitution acceptable to both. The labours of this commission advancing too slowly to satisfy him, he himself sets to work, composes a Liturgy, an immediate trial of which he makes in his chapel at Potsdam. Its first reception was little favourable; Lutherans and Reformed persons, orthodox and liberal, emulously criticise the production of the Royal theologian, especially complaining of his interference in Church affairs. By force of perseverance, however, and by means of a certain latitude left to the different parties in the choice of liturgical formularies, he in 1830 obtains the adhesion of a number of churches, particularly of the Reformed party, belonging to different parts of Germany, those specially of the Duchy of Nassau, of the Grand Duchy of Baden, of Bavaria and Prussia lying on the Rhine. He then thinks himself prepared to act with severity against the recalcitrant Lutheran conventicles;

but immediately a formidable schism breaks out. The most excited Lutherans, rather than adhere to the threatened union, emigate to America. To retain the others, Frederick William IV., on his ascent to the throne, finds himself obliged to acknowledge their separation, and to grant them a distinct department in the ecclesiastical council. The political reaction of 1849 increased still more the ascendancy of this ultra-Lutheran party, the number of which rapidly grew from fifteen to sixty-five thousand souls. Instead of one single Protestant Church, Germany counts three, on whom new attempts at union have not yet been crowned with full success. In other Protestant countries, the same debates between the civil and the religious authority have been reproduced under other forms, and, owing to the retroactive movement which affects certain churches, have ended in similar results. In England, when Dr. Hampden, known as a rationalist, had been promoted to the see of Hereford; then, when the Queen's Council had absolved Vicar Gorham, condemned by his bishop for certain bold opinions on baptismal regeneration, a numerous assembly of ecclesiastics and laymen of various ranks, convoked in London, protested against those judgments, and demanded the restoration of the authority of the synodal meetings of the clergy, as the sole judge competent in ecclesiastical matters. There were the same protestations some years after, when the Court of Arches had absolved two of the editors of "Essays and Reviews." The two parties, the Evangelical and the Ritualistic, combined to demand the re-establishment of the ancient "Ecclesiastical Convocation," and by that means obtained from the civil authority "the Act of Subscription," by which young ecclesiastics engage to

profess the received doctrines. In Scotland, it is the right of patronage over the churches, with the incontestable abuses which it engenders, which has put the government and the clergy in an attitude of hostility. After long and fruitless action on the civil authority, which considered the right of patrons in the election of pastors as an inviolable authority, the Church of Scotland came to another rupture; a considerable number of its ministers, under the direction of Dr. Chalmers, separated from the national Establishment, and, owing to the liberality of their flocks, founded an independent Church, still more numerous than those which, in the preceding century, separated on the same account. This last secession, it is said, reckons nearly a thousand places of worship.*

In the Canton of Vaud, where the authority of the Helvetic Confession was suppressed in 1839 by an act of the Grand Council, and where the radical government attempted a new abuse of authority, it is by separation that one part of the pastoral body took its revenge and asserted its autonomy. The success of that separation would have been more real and more complete if its necessity had been more evident, and the political power had had less to do with it. You may refuse to read a radical manifesto, and then leave to the government the odious act of a suspension or a general deposition, instead of aiding, by a voluntary resignation, to free yourself without risk from a hostile and recalcitrant clergy. The separation of the Vaudois clergy, effected under conditions very different to those of the clergy of Scotland, had the character of a

* Moreover, in the last Parliament, a change in the same direction was made, which transferred the patronage in the Established Church of Scotland from the hands of a few persons of position and wealth, into those which represent the congregations themselves.—*Translator.*

suicide much more than a martyrdom, and did nothing but injure the ascendancy of the ecclesiastical ministry which it was intended to elevate.

IV.

RETURN OF CONFESSIONAL STRUGGLES.

THE retrograde movement which in each of the Christian communions thus put the civil authority in conflict with the religious, exercised a worse influence still over the relations of those communions one with another. At the beginning of our century, those relations seemed to be sensibly ameliorated. "The critical spirit of the preceding period," says Professor Dorner, "in causing the secondary points which divided the Christian parties to be appreciated in a calmer manner relatively to the vital principles of Christianity, had contributed to the enlargement of people's hearts." In Germany, the traditions of philosophic toleration of Joseph II.; in Russia, those of Catherine II., strengthened in Alexander I. by the lessons of his preceptor; in France, Napoleon's firm resolution to maintain the religious rights of all his subjects, sufficed to keep fanaticism at bay. Moreover, there was scarcely need of the check. The different Christian parties had suffered together and from the same adversaries; they had sought their support, their consolations, at the same source, in the common treasury of the sentiments and hopes which, for truly religious souls, are at the bottom everywhere the same. With that common language all could and did understand each other, because they were sin-

cerely disposed to do so. How far were they from applying the microscope to the questions by which they were divided! In the midst of the political interests of the moment, what leisure had they for dogmatical disputes? While the fire of war raged all over Europe, who could have the courage to enkindle that of religious discords? In their common disgraces they had need of mutual aid. The priests, in particular, could not forget that, in the days of proscriptions and massacres, it was among heretics that they had often found an asylum and protection. Relations of touching fraternity were thus formed between members of different communions, and public life itself felt the happy effect of the influence. It was at this moment that the Academy of Niort crowned with its prize a panegyric by Duplessis-Mornay; that the Institute of France opened a competition on the influence of Luther's reformation, and crowned a Catholic author (Villers) who had celebrated its benefits; it was then that, on occasion of the coronation of the Emperor by Pius VII., Lecoz, Archbishop of Besançon, invited the Protestant ministers of Paris to "revive, under the auspices of such a prince and such a pope," the projects of union that had been put forward between Molanus and Bossuet. With probably greater sincerity and earnestness, the excellent Tabaraud, priest of the Oratory at Lyons, manifested the hope that, "awaiting the moment of union in a common faith, all parties, animated by the spirit of Christianity, would live together in peace and concord." There were the same dispositions in the Catholic clergy of Germany. "The Church," says Tschirner, "beaten down by its reverses, in several countries deprived of its bishops, forcibly subjected to military powers, shewed itself moderate in its pretensions. Catholics in high places

—Dalberg, Wessenberg, Michael Sailer, Werkmeister, and others—propagated around them humane and tolerant maxims: even in the dogmatic works published at that time, polemics were all but absent." In 1815, finally, in the treaty of "the Holy Alliance," the sovereigns manifested the same spirit of concord, when, in the intoxication of their triumph, they declared that they wished to forget all ecclesiastical diversities.

But what, under the influence of a real religious revival, had seemed practicable and easy, was less so under that of the retrograde movement which we have described. Among the churches, which to re-animate the faith and piety of their adherents accounted nothing more urgent than for each to return to their original principles, to replace themselves on their ancient bases, for each to throw into prominence their institutions, their distinctive doctrines, and who found their rulers eager to support them —among these clergymen, entirely occupied with regaining their old ascendancy, to dispute with each for the control of souls, how was it possible for old controversies not to be re-agitated? In yielding themselves severally to the current of the age, they insensibly approached each other. In going back, on the contrary, toward a past made up of periods so different, here toward the dogmas of the sixteenth century, there toward those of the thirteenth, they again found themselves in the same opposition—were, in a word, carried back to the rivalries and the hostilities of former days. Peace was scarcely signed between the civil authorities, than war broke out between the churches, and naturally, before all others, in the countries where, as in France, in Germany, in Ireland, they existed together under the same government. Now, since the peace of 1815, the number of those mixed states had considerably

increased. In re-casting the map of Europe, the Congress, solely prepossessed with political interests and the conveniences of the victorious powers, had beaten down almost everywhere in the West the walls of legal separation formerly raised by the Treaty of Westphalia, had united in the same states and under the same laws, peoples who of old had fought with each other bitter religious wars,—former subjects of Bavaria and the Palatinate, of Brandenburg and the bishoprics of the borders of the Rhine, of Dutch and Belgians, of Genevese and Savoyards, of French and Bernese, of Catholics and Protestants of the banks of the Aar. Brought together thus for the first time, and mostly against their will, those populations of different faiths soon accused each other mutually of projects of domination or absorption, to which they opposed, on their side, projects of the same nature. These distrusts were vivid specially among the Catholics of Belgium, of Hesse, of the Rhine provinces, of Hanover, of Baden, of Würtemberg, of several cantons of Switzerland, which, subject to Protestant governments, saw everywhere intentions adverse to their liberty of conscience. These animosities, now secret, now open, gaining the minds of Catholics the most indifferent, but disquieted respecting the maintenance of their civil rights, ended, as in Belgium, Ireland, Argovia, in projects of violent separation, fomented by the aid of revolutions. Otherwheres, in countries subject to Catholic governments, the same hatred, fired by the clergy, manifested themselves by exclusive or persecuting measures. In reality, the Roman Church had abandoned none of its absolutist pretensions. Its representatives repeated in all manner of tones the maxim, that toleration in matters of faith is only indifference; that a people without a State religion is a nation of Atheists; that reli-

gious liberty is the exclusive privilege of truth; and that, when you are not compelled, to authorize the profession of heresy is a crime against God of the deepest dye. One of the first acts of Pius VII., on his return, was to rage against the Bible Societies, the "impious and pestilential machination of the innovators," he said, "a device which shook religion in its very foundation." From that moment fanaticism opened a new career in Italy. The Vaudois of Piedmont fell back into the same state in which they were before 1796, exposed, as then, to the vexations of their adversaries, and, until 1848, the toleration which it was desired to obtain for them was not secured except owing to the particular protection of England and Prussia.

In Germany, the sixth article of the Conclusions of the Congress of Vienna, declaring that the difference of Christian confessions put no difference in the enjoyment of political and civil rights, was truly observed in only Protestant lands. In Austria, nearly all the liberty bestowed by Joseph II. was taken back; the Protestants enjoyed only a precarious toleration, and were, particularly in the Tyrol and Hungary, exposed to treatment which forced thousands of them to emigrate into the States of Prussia.

In France, the article of the Charter of 1814, which gave back to the Catholic religion the title of religion of the State, evidently re-opened the door to measures of intolerance, and in the higher as in the lower classes there was no lack of people disposed by ambition, hate or jealousy, to re-commence, under a crowd of pretexts, the persecutions against the Protestants. Had they not taken part in the Revolution? Were they not secret partizans of the fallen usurper? Had they not, under Robespierre and Napoleon, got all offices into their hands? Had they

not given the Bourbons a cold reception? In the department of the South, especially in Gard, where they were the more numerous and consequently the most detested, the more rich and consequently the most envied, bands of assassins, emboldened by the baseness or the connivance of the local magistrates, spread themselves abroad in Nîmes, Uzès, Anduze, plundering Protestant houses and massacring all that resisted. In Paris nothing of this was known, or ignorance of all was pretended. When Voyer d'Argenson denounced these crimes to the Chamber of Deputies, he was called to order; yet more than a hundred Protestants had been murdered in Nîmes, without reckoning the garrison which protected them, traitorously massacred after a capitulation, and three generals, whose murderers were acquitted by the Assize Court. It was necessary for Sir Samuel Romilly to obtain a vote in the Parliament of England solemnly protesting against these atrocities, which the French Government was compelled to acknowledge, when supported by all Protestant Europe. The Charter of 1830, in recognizing Catholicism only as "the religion of the majority," sensibly ameliorated the position of the French Protestants. But after 1848, the Socialistic movements furnished the *Catholic Church* throughout Europe with pretexts for restricting or suppressing religious liberty. That Church, which by its blind rancour toward the Orleans family, and by its ignorance of all the true principles of social economy, was to so great an extent responsible for those movements; that Church, which had fallen on its knees before Radicalism in power, did not cease to preach in all pulpits, and to assert by the pen of its principal writers, the complicity of Protestantism with Socialism and the Revolution. Under this pretext, proscription began again in Spain and Italy;

Tuscany retrograded two centuries on the road of religious liberty; all the strength which its government succeeded in regaining was consecrated to the burning of Bibles, the closing of chapels, thrusting excellent people into prison, who had been guilty of having circulated the sacred writings or spoken in favour of reform. Protestant Hungary, which since 1844 had recovered some liberty and obtained some redress, saw itself, after the war of 1849, replaced under the yoke. Most of the liberal resolutions decreed in 1849 in the National Assembly of Frankfort, were, with all the others, annulled in 1853 by the reactionary "Act of Alliance;" and the Concordat of the Emperor of Austria with Rome, concluded two years afterwards, without bringing on the Protestants persecutions properly so called, gave to the bishops a control over the civil order, over the press, over public instruction, the most dangerous to liberty of conscience. Finally, in France, on each new revolution, scenes similar to those of 1815 made their appearance, and in 1870 the Protestants were pointed out by certain bishops to the blind fanaticism of their flocks as the emissaries and spies of Prussia.

Unhappily, intolerance is a contagious vice which at last seizes those who have had most reason to complain of it. In seeing from the commencement of this century its maxims all but constantly professed and re-produced by the Roman clergy, down to the day when, with greater solemnity than ever, they were proclaimed by the Encyclical Syllabus of Pius IX. (1864)—in seeing them so frequently transformed against them into acts of unjust violence, the Protestants may intelligibly, if not in a measure excusably, as measures of precaution, have allowed themselves to deviate from the principles of freedom inhe-

rent in the Reformation, and shewn themselves less ready than might have been expected to bestow on the Catholics living in their midst an entire equality of rights. Having so often learnt by experience that Catholicism admits no other liberty than its own, they feared, if they yielded ever so little of their preponderance, lest they should find themselves duped by their generous dispositions. Hence the anxieties of the ecclesiastical Company of Geneva, when, in 1814, the Sardinian parishes were annexed to the territory of the Republic under the protection of the Treaty of Turin, and the request which it addressed to the Government that, "reserving the privileges granted to the Catholics by that Treaty, it should engage to maintain the Reformed religion as being that of the State." Then, when the fears on the subject of the increase of the Catholic population in the canton were realized, and its clergy were seen working with Radicalism in order to overturn ancient institutions of the country, measures of exclusion, which if equitable were impracticable, were attempted to maintain the Protestant ascendancy intact. About the same time, as reprisals for a display of Ultramontane fanaticism and separatist attempts in divers cantons, the Government of Argovia sequestered, as accomplices, eight old monasteries on its territory guaranteed by the federal treaty (1841); the Diet sanctioned that spoliation; required the Catholic Diet to dissolve their "League of Sarnen," and to dismiss the Jesuit teachers established at Lucerne (1844), the seat of their governing body; by the war of the Sonderbund upset the governments of those cantons, and again and again expelled the Jesuits from all the Helvetic territory.

The same distrusts maintained down to 1829 the exclusion of the Catholics of Great Britain from the English

Parliament, and down to 1870 compelled the immense majority of those of Ireland to support magnificently a form of worship hostile to their own. Thence have ensued irreconcilable aversions and at the least offensive manifestations; sanguinary rows broke out in Stockport, Limerick, Belfast, Birmingham, &c. (1852-67). Even in America, that land of liberty, a formidable assemblage of Irish, who by means of their number had got possession of the municipal offices (1834-44), called forth in Boston and Philadelphia bloody conflicts which lasted several days. In 1862, the States General of Sweden rejected a law in favour of religious liberty, and renewed against the Catholics measures of exclusion which, under the preceding reign, had fallen into disuse. In Mecklenburg, down to 1873, they remained excluded from the rights of citizenship.

In the Russian empire, the Confessional struggle preserved still longer than in the West the character of severity which the politico-religious reaction of our age had imprinted upon it. Alexander I., who at the beginning of his reign had shewn a pretty extensive toleration, soon became disquieted at the abuses which the Jesuits committed at his expense. Informed of their intrigues with certain noble families of Russia, and of the state of excitement which they kept up among the Catholics of Poland, he took from them the hospitality granted them by Catharine II. (1820), and expelled their order from his dominions. Nicholas, moreover, suppressed all the Catholic convents which contained only a small number of monks, and all those who lived in the provinces of the Greek religion, in Southern Russia among others; he thus diminished the number by three-fourths, and consecrated the product of the sale of their goods to an annual subvention to the secular Latin clergy. In 1596, the Jesuits had, with

the aid of Sigismund III., succeeded in subduing to the yoke of Rome, under the name of *United Greeks*, two millions of the inhabitants of Lithuania, then subject to Poland. This province having in 1774 fallen into the hands of Russia, and the Greek element growing stronger there every day, Nicholas, at the unanimous request of the bishops and a part of the clergy, made them return into the Greek Church, whose rites and liturgy they had preserved almost entirely (1839). All this did not satisfy his policy of unification. From the time of the rebellion of Poland (1831), he resolved to denationalize that country, four-fifths of whose population were Catholics; impeded in every way the relations of its clergy with Rome; permitted it only under rigorous conditions to construct new churches; took from it all its influence over the public schools; and finally confiscated its endowments to the public treasury. These measures, though mitigated by the Concordat of 1847, did not fail to call forth strong dissatisfaction among the Poles. The events of 1848 raised their hopes; the clergy profited thereby to encourage among them a spirit of insubordination, which soon issued in a revolt (1861). Five days after the publication of the decree of Alexander II. which abolished serfdom, the Polish nobility, who considered themselves injured by that measure of justice and humanity, broke out into an insurrection, and with the aid of the monks and the clergy drew the people over to their side. The rebellion, heated by prayer-meetings, soon shewed itself by odious assassinations and then by open war (1863), during which the convents served the insurgents as strongholds. The suppression of the revolt gave occasion to fresh rigour, followed by the rupture of the Concordat and that of all bonds with Rome. Finally, conversions attempted, not without success, in some saloons

of Paris on members of the exiled Russian nobility, and other griefs still more serious, completed the discord of the two courts. All the Catholic dioceses of Poland, except two, were deprived of their episcopal rights, and priests who refused to officiate in the Russian language were transported into the interior of the country (1868). The Russian language became obligatory in most of the provinces and in the University of Varsovia; in 1869, a bishop was exiled into Siberia for having refused to acknowledge the authority of the Catholic College established by the Emperor. But it was not at the cost of Catholicism alone that the Czars aimed to establish religious unity in their empire. According to an edict of Nicholas, every Russian that abjured the national religion, whatever form of faith he embraced, was, in virtue of an ancient law lately revived (1832), deprived of his civil rights and condemned to confiscation. In spite of the Treaty of 1743, which had guaranteed to the Lutherans of the provinces of the Baltic the free exercise of their religion, Nicholas, in 1846, extended to those provinces another law which stipulated that every child born of a mixed marriage should be baptized in the Greek communion. A general plan of organization for the Protestant churches of all Russia placed them under the direction of a superintendent or bishop and of a general consistory, the administration of which was in the hands of the minister of the interior. Moreover, Nicholas established in some of the principal cities of Livonia Greek bishops, who engaged in proselyting attempts, now vexatious, now perfidious. It is thus that in 1847 the Bishop of Riga, profiting by a famine which raged in the Russian provinces of the Baltic, led the Lutheran peasants to hope, as the price of their abjuration, for concessions of land, with an exemption of taxes and

imposts. This deceptive promise induced more than fifty thousand of them to pass over to the Greek religion; then, when afterwards their families wished to re-enter the Lutheran Church, the laws against abjuration were placed in their way, and those who refused communion at the hands of the Popes were exposed to vexations which were not mitigated until the reign of the actual Czar.

CHAPTER II.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN REACTION.

I.

AMONG CATHOLICS.

When a religion has momentarily lost its empire over opinion, it cannot recover its influence durably except so far as it frees itself from the errors and abuses which had alienated the popular mind, and gives satisfaction to their new moral and spiritual wants. What then was there to hope for Christianity from the retrograde movement which we have described, and which so closely followed the happy revival of the commencement of the century? What a rock for the reviving faith was that new rupture with the human mind! what a deception for a well-informed generation, eager for more light, to see itself carried back by its religious guides into a sphere where all was darkness and mystery; where, to escape from the suspicion of heresy, it was necessary to close your eyes to evidence; where reason, treated as a rebel, was interdicted or subjected to ceaseless torture; where, the more effectually to mortify it, the Church took pleasure in making it confess what was absurd and incredible! Where are the means in the nineteenth century, to persuade yourself that a

priest, with his prayers, his genuflexions, his signs of the cross, made God come down on to the altar, and thence pass into the mouths of the communicants? Some, indeed, in order to humour the sentiment of the multitude, affected to bow before so great a mystery—to hear in the service without a frown the legend of the saint of the day; they would even, in order to honour the ashes of a relative, pay liberally for masses, wax candles, litanies, and *De Profundis;* but recompence was sought for the constraint thus imposed on themselves, by scepticism in the heart's core, and, in presence of their equals and associates, by disdain and mockery.

After a revolution which boasted of having broken every yoke, how could men consent to bear that of the priest; how make him as a matter of duty the confidant of their thoughts; how see him mingle in the family relations, to which his vocation and his desires made him an utter stranger; how see him speculate on the religious indifference of husbands, in order to get possession of the direction of their wives; or the worldly tastes of fathers and mothers, in order to get into his hands the education of their children; how hear him authorize or prohibit marriage, seat himself at the bed of the dying in order to obtain, now legacies and bequests, now retractations profitable for the Church; and, when he was unable to give to his pretensions the support of the law, to have recourse to moral constraint, and, with the aid of the secrets of which confession made him master, govern by fear when he failed to do so by love and confidence? Since protracted wars had come to an end, since the natural and artificial barriers had sunk among nations, humanity aspired more and more to form only one nation, and, in some sort, one single family; and yet this was the age that

fanaticism chose for raising new walls between individuals and peoples; that, in the name of national unity, confessional unity was claimed; that, in the name of confessional unity, intolerant priests demanded laws of exclusion; that a press, calling itself Christian, while in reality it is Ultramontane, took pleasure in surpassing in violent invective the most licentious political papers; that the communion which calls itself emphatically the Church, when its temporal interests were at stake did not think it wrong to raise the cry of war; finally, that a Pope, to expiate the political weaknesses of the commencement of his pontificate, devoted to the execration of the Christian world the liberties that are most urgently claimed by modern civilization! Scarcely had the middle classes entered into possession of their rights, so long contested, when, in the name of re-established Christianity, they saw them disputed afresh. The same divine character with which the clergy asserted that they were stamped, was invoked by them in favour of civil powers which secured for them an honourable place in the State, and in favour of the higher classes which supported the Church by their wealth and their influence. Privilege had no more ardent advocates; liberty, however moderate, had no more embittered adversaries, if only because it served as an auxiliary to science and a support to free inquiry. The liberty of governments themselves, when they were in conflict with the pretensions of the Church, was not better respected. Did they wish to spread and to popularize instruction, it was necessary, under penalty of encountering a tenacious and almost insurmountable rivalry, to employ therein the monastic congregations. Did they wish, in order to raise the standard of knowledge, to employ the best qualified teachers, if such men were not approved by the Church they must

be set aside as suspected. Did they wish, in order to promote commerce, industry and the arts, to secure for foreigners full liberty of worship, the clergy invoked the laws which protected its own exclusively. Fresh opposition if, in order to encourage labour, they wished to lessen the number of legal holidays. Everywhere, in a word, they found their hands tied in the execution of the measures that were required by the interests of the people. When, then, was the condition in which the Church ruled as absolute master? Since 1815, there was not among civilized nations a state in which commerce and industry were more languishing, agriculture more deplorably neglected, justice worse administered, popular instruction worse in kind and more restricted, the sciences more in the rear, the whole administration, in a word, more in opposition to the actual wants and possibilities of civilization, than the Papal Government, and all that were framed after its model. To judge Christianity independently of the forms under which it appears at different times and in different places, to disjoin its cause from that of men who speak and act in its name, supposes, we have said, a discernment rare among the many, and especially rare in a communion in which Christianity is identified with the Church and considered as incarnated in it, and where the gospel is a sealed book to the people—where the words of Christ reach them only in an indirect manner, and most frequently in a language which they do not understand. Witnesses of the hindrances which the clergy in our days throw in the way of the most desirable advances, such as the advances of truth, peace, true liberty, and social union, many persons impute these imperfections to Christianity itself, array against it hostile sentiments which were thought to have disappeared with the last century, and

pronounce it incompatible with all forms of social prosperity, with every well-regulated social constitution. Most adverse, under some popes, have been the civil and religious dispositions of the Roman and Italian citizens. "In Germany," says Gervinus, "scarcely had the governments withdrawn, in the name of civil and religious order, the liberties that had been promised during the war, when there appeared among the youth a current of ideas at once revolutionary and anti-christian." In France, in the same way, under the first restoration, hardly were the measures seen which the clergy took to recover their old prerogatives, scarcely did people see the convents re-peopled, fanaticism re-kindled, a society adverse to progress formed near the throne in order to patronize these arrangements, than the irreligious movement of the preceding century regained favour. The violent sermons of the clerical missionaries were replied to by the blasphemies of the crowd. Each new publication of Bonald and Joseph de Maistre gave birth to the re-impression of some of the works of Voltaire; and while, amid the applauses of the higher classes, Hugo and Lamartine celebrated in their songs the triumph of restored Christianity, P. L. Courier in his clever pamphlets, and Beranger in his songs, covered with ridicule the stupid yoke which it was attempted to fasten on their shoulders. "It is from the beginning of the nineteenth century," says M. Vacherot, "that we must date the true popular movement against religious tradition. There existed that 'anarchy of minds' with which Lamennais said the youth were infected. At an early day Saint-Beuve and Tocqueville saw the movement and indicated its cause." Sismondi, who had saluted the religious revival with joy, when he had witnessed in 1831 the new profanations of which Paris was the theatre,

deplored the ill-considered measures that were attempted to be opposed to it. "Religious sentiments," he said in a letter to Channing, "have during this century made progress in France; but I am not sure that the imprudent efforts of those who wish to re-animate them have not really put them back. Like you, I believe that quite a new kind of instruction is necessary to satisfy pious minds, but I do not see such a blessing announced anywhere. Quite the reverse. I see religion reproduced in its abuses and on its hateful side." Spiritualism, restored to honour by some eminent philosophers, was at first welcomed with transport by the lettered youth; their dispositions changed when, introduced by authority into schools and lyceums, it appeared only as an instrument of the double reaction. The French philosophy, on the traces of the medical school of Cabanis, Gall and de Broussais, began again to deviate from the side of materialism, whose followers became daily more numerous. One of them, Auguste Comte, without explicitly denying God, declared that he knew Him not. "There is no reason," he said, "for searching for anything beyond sensible phenomena; science ought to be sober in regard to hypotheses, and forbid itself every question touching causes and ends. Content with observing facts and tracing their laws, it ought to exclude from its determinations all ulterior conclusions. Religion, the sole means of education accessible for the infancy of humanity, as are metaphysics in its youth, ought in its ripe age to yield place to pure empiricism." Such was the principle of what received the name of "the Positive school." *Positive* enough, doubtless, but not philosophical, if the essential character of philosophy is the research of causes, of first principles; so that philosophy, which after having, often with sagacity, traced the laws which govern the

universe, disdains to inquire what is the name of the law-giver, mutilates capriciously the human mind by disowning one function while owning others, and seems to cut the wings of metaphysics only from the fear of seeing that application of the human mind meet and welcome in flight, that religion which must at whatever price be barred out. By the side of that Positive philosophy there stands in France "the critical school," which, struck by what it calls the imperfection of this world, in face of the perfection inseparable from the idea of God, sees in Him only the ideal world insensibly disengaging itself from the actual world, in such a way that, according to it, God, properly speaking, does not exist, but becomes, and ceases not to become, without ever being able to be. From this school comes a sceptical school more dangerous still, which sees in God only a category or form of thought—the absolute; but, the absolute not being able to exist, the idea of God has in consequence nothing real, and immortality, defined as survival in God, equally disappears. The existence of the world is explained "by a kind of internal and secret spring which impels into existence everything possible." As to the person of Jesus, if that school does not idealize him, as we shall see it has done in Germany, to such an extent as to take from him all real existence—if even, in a celebrated work, it has evidently endeavoured and in some respects succeeded in elevating him in the eyes of the indifferentists of our age (1863), failing to apprehend in its exquisite simplicity the physiognomy of Jesus such as it appears in the Gospels—it paints him under features, now of a gallant, now of a fanatic, and now, in the explanation of certain miracles, of a charlatan. (Renan.)

Finally, there is in France a class of minds which, taxing

with feticism even the systems but now mentioned, as well as all those who retain a shadow of religion, proclaim atheism as the principle of every truly republican government. If such were the sentiments of a part of the middle class while yet it had to struggle for the maintenance of its rights, what were the dispositions of the people when even more urgently, claiming its place in society, demanding of society labour less crushing, better paid, a system which should open to it in its turn access to liberty and to comfort, it complained that, far from finding in Christianity the auxiliary on which it thought it might rely, it really found in it only an additional obstacle to its legitimate aspirations?

Food and shelter in some religious house under the condition of celibacy and the cloister, alms from day to day obtained by some appearances of devotion, were for the people less a benefit than a humiliating servitude. Despite all the palliatives, the secret of which the Church boasted the possession of, the wound of pauperism remained open; and the indigent, comparing his habitual nakedness with the prosperity which he witnessed around him, was only too ready to lend an ear to perfidious enticements. "Cease," it was said, "to reckon for the alleviation of thy lot on God and His worshippers. Those who call themselves thy brethren in Christ are not afflicted at thy privations except on account of the perils which they occasion to themselves; at the bottom they resign themselves to them, and their priests agree with them in not hastening their termination. Their religion is only a lure to deceive thy misery and cares; their hell is only a bugbear against the temptations to which thou art exposed by thy poverty. Solely absorbed with the interests of the rich, they have long enough preached to you abstinence and resignation; long enough

have they talked to you of the joys of Paradise, while recompensing themselves out of the good of which you are deprived here below. Why do they refuse you that paradise on earth? Christianity has never ceased to glorify the spirit; the time is come to give matter its due; to inaugurate that new religion whose ministers—pontiffs in art, science, industry—shall apportion social forces and riches to each one according to his capacity, and to each capacity according to its products." Others would indeed retain Christianity, but on the condition that, taking for type what is told of the primitive church of Jerusalem, they should unfold the banner of Communism and make of each church a sort of phalanster.

At this time all the religious questions in France were absorbed in social questions. The Socialist systems of St. Simon, Fourier, Considerant; the Communist systems of the Icarians, the Reformists, of Babeuf and Proudhon—right of labour, right of credit, equality of wages, suppression of competition, abolition of property—were so many solutions proposed and tried, only to dash themselves against ridicule, impossibility, bankruptcy, or society armed in its own defence. But while waiting for the combined efforts of science and true charity to aid in solving this formidable problem, the leaven of irreligion continued to ferment in the bosom of the masses, in secret societies, in the Carbonari of Italy, the "Solidaires" of France and Belgium, among the associates of "Free Thought" in the international clubs, who set in front of their frightful designs savage proclamations of Atheism. We must, they said, tear out of the heart of modern society that religion which is a perpetual obstacle to its progress; we must drive it from the school, from the state, from the hearth; we must take from it every pretext and every means of interposing

in social relations. No more religious instruction; no other morality, if you want a morality at all, than an independent one! The priest has identified his interests with those of religion, his authority with that of God; in order the more surely to hand him out of all the domains that he has invaded, we must banish God from all hearts.

The result did not tarry long. In these ill-omened days, when hates long smouldering might gratify themselves with impunity, the conflagration of Paris, the assassination of the ministers of religion, "have," to quote the words of Father Hyacinthe, "been the work of a people who no longer has a God;" and, as he adds with equal reason, "the work of those who make it impossible to believe in God, and emphatically impossible to love Him."

II.

AMONG PROTESTANTS AND GREEKS.

THE Protestant retrograde movement was doubtless far from putting human reason, conscience and dignity, to trials so severe. Accordingly, the reaction which it occasioned was far from reaching the degree of violence and generality that it attained in the Catholic world. Who, however, will assert that it gave no hold to the detractors of the Christian cause? Without speaking of the dryness of its traditional dogma, opposed to the spirit of Jesus on so many points; without recalling the vain disputes which it revived, it made religion serve ends unworthy of it; associate it with a policy adverse to intellectual and social progress; purchase the support of the civil power, the protection of the upper classes, by authoritative doctrines kindred

to those of Rome; proscribe science, imprison thought in the inflexible bonds of old formularies; abuse Scripture as Rome abused tradition; and finally bring back into theology notions incompatible with all that observation reveals to us on the harmony and perfection of the Divine government.

This spirit of obscurantism in the bosom of Protestant communities, those measures of spiritual enslavement for which Christianity was unjustly made responsible, awakened against it an opposition which in some Protestant countries led to the return of the anti-christian Deism of the last century, and in others, in greater number of instances, to the re-appearance of Pantheism. This sad system —which makes of the universe an effect without a cause, which excludes from it a good and wise Providence, which explains the harmonious action visible on all sides only by the action of blind necessity—had in former times served to combat now the polytheism and now the dualism of the popular beliefs—adopted for the same purpose by some mystic Jews and Christians of the middle ages—resuscitated and learnedly elaborated in the seventeenth century by the genius of Spinoza, favoured by the tendency to unity which characterizes modern science—it, from the end of the eighteenth century, introduced itself into the spiritual schools of Germany. Fichte made of it the basis of his "Theory of Science;" Schelling, of his "Philosophy of Nature;" Hegel, finally, of his "Absolute Idealism." In none of them, however, any more than in its first disciples, did this system present itself as hostile to Christianity. Göthe, who avowed himself "a not-Christian," denied that he was "against Christ;" and as to the philosophers just named, we have seen that the majority, whether from prudence or deference, set forth their doctrine clothed in

the most orthodox attire. The death of Hegel tore in pieces all the veils (1831). After he was gone, his school split into two parts, and while the Hegelian right faithfully preserved the formulæ of the master, the left, an innovator in religion as well as politics, boldly unfolded the consequences of his doctrine, and turned them against the Church as well as against the State. Dr. Strauss, before becoming a disciple of Hegel, had applied to the Gospels the most absolute maxims of the critical school of Tübingen. Collecting together all the objections which it had raised against the reality of certain facts of the evangelical history, and advancing new ones; dissecting with the boldest and sharpest scalpel the whole of that history; devoting to ridicule the arbitrary explanations by which the old rationalism of Paulus had attempted to save the authority of the sacred historians (1835), he left in the life of Jesus only a series of myths, or, to speak more directly, one single great myth, destined in the first ages of our era to represent an idea with which, according to him, humanity was then pre-occupied, namely, that of the manifestation of God in man—of the ideality of the human nature with the divine. It was a new path, a critical path, by which he arrived at the conclusions of the Hegelian philosophy. But after all, he said, what matters the falseness of the fact, provided the idea is recognized as true? This epithet of God-man, which ecclesiastical Christology applied to an individual, the Hegelian Christology applied to the race; all that was false in the one became true in the other, in such a way that an Hegelian could accept, as an emblem of the highest conceptions of philosophy, what the evangelists recount of Christ. Thus Strauss displayed the pantheism which formed the foundation of the pretended orthodoxy of Hegel. Great was the scandal in the

theological world. Strauss's work was assailed on all sides, and if several of his criticisms survive, and compel his adversaries to concessions more or less important, it was nevertheless easy to defend against him the historical reality of the person of Jesus. "Not thus do people invent," Rousseau had already said. Dr. Strauss himself, in the second edition of his book, acknowledges that the negation of the miracles in no way involves the non-existence of the personage of whom the miracles are narrated. But even the repute gained by a book whose conclusions are so fantastic, sufficiently proved that more absorbing questions, more actual interests, agitated men's minds at the time. These were political and social questions. It was the middle class which claimed the constitutions promised and constantly postponed; it was the labouring class who demanded a prompt alleviation of their misery; it was the ambitious class of scholars, or (as they are called) "Literates" emerging in university cities; in a word, it was, as in France, Radicalism, and in its suite Socialism, which were preparing their batteries; it was the revolution suppressed in 1830, which smouldered under its ashes. The governments of Germany made a rampart of the restored orthodox Church; to overthrow the political edifice, the assailants began to bombard the religious bastion; to capture the palace, they undermined the sanctuary. In vain did Schelling, seeing the excitement of the political powers, hasten to deny all paternity in regard to these subversive doctrines; in vain did he boast that by his metaphysics he healed the wounds inflicted by Hegel. From his lectures in Berlin (1841), though their etiquette was Christian and their tissue was brilliant, there after all came forth only a new form of Pantheism. The work of demolition carried on by the Hegelian left pursued its

path, and its new chiefs, finding in the idealism of Strauss, too vaporous for them, only an insufficient weapon, drew more absolute consequences from the master's principles. Then they spoke only of "the evolutions of the idea through the spheres of the phenomenal world," of "its incarnation in the God-man." All these metaphysical subtleties they touched only with their fingers' ends; but they intoxicated themselves with humanitarian pantheism. "The hostile powers," said M. Vacherot, "had resumed their weapons; theology found itself face to face with criticism." That mythical creation which Strauss referred to a noble enthusiasm, Bruno Bauer made the product of a gross error in these, and an interested fraud in those. In his "German Annals," Feuerbach declared that in the belief in a God he saw only a discreditable illusion which man imposes on himself, in worshipping as God his own individuality. If, as the master has made clear, it is in humanity alone that God acquires consciousness of Himself, humanity can recognize no other God than itself. But, said Max Stirner in his turn, what is that humanity, that abstraction, that they want us to worship? I know no other than the *me;* it is to it alone that I owe myself; and that me I know only under its palpable form, which in my eyes is the only real form. The material I is our God; its qualities are our law. Every man is his own God, and this world is all its future. The soul is a senseless word. As to that world to come that they preach to us, it is an error upheld by Absolutism in nations whose present it confiscates. "Each one has a right to all," was the motto of "Young Germany," whose views it expressed in regard to morality and social order, and it was under this flag that it prepared to combat the political and religious despotism preached up by the "Evangelical Gazette"

of Berlin. Thus, under the influence of the revolutionary spirit, there came forth from the empty and hollow bosom of German idealism a materialism more dense, more gross even than that of the French Communists, and which, profiting by the discontent of the labouring classes, diffused among them its maxims subversive of all religion and all morality. As soon as the first symptoms of political agitation had caused the condition of beliefs and morals in Protestant Germany, as well as Vienna and Munich, to be closely examined, the saddest sight offered itself to the eyes of the investigators. It was found (so states "The History of the Interior Mission") that "during the sleep of worthy souls"—say rather the placid content of stationary minds—"there had been formed a formidable organization which, armed with insult, hate and fury, had undertaken a war to the knife against religion and faith." At Hamburg, while the number of human births increased considerably every year, that of communicants decreased in a greater proportion; a number of young men and women had not been confirmed, and formed part of no church. In Prussia, the commissioners found in the poorer classes multitudes to whom the Gospel was something unknown, and thousands who never entered a temple, "so that in Berlin, in parishes of twenty thousand souls, there were churches which had not a dozen present at public worship, while in the streets you might meet a crowd of intoxicated persons." In the single year 1843, thirty-five thousand children were born out of marriage. Here there were formed societies of "Free-thinkers" that had ten thousand members, and corresponded with forty similar societies in Germany. There you might find confraternities of fellow-workmen whose mission it was to form the labouring youth to idleness, insubordination,

disorder, irreligion, and all the vices. In their meetings, and in many families where their lessons had produced fruit, the most odious blasphemies were uttered, and the lowest principles held the place of morality. "We have," said Dr. Wichern, "heard in a cottage these very words: 'Religion and its Head have been invented only to harass the poor and keep power in the hands of the great.'" "I myself am God," said a working man. "I am a pagan," said a mother of six children, with perfect indifference; "I have never known anything of Christianity." At the moment then when, under the reign of the pious Frederick William IV., "The Evangelical Gazette" exulted in seeing, owing to the severe measures of the Minister of Public Worship, rationalism decrease from year to year in the bosom of the clergy, such were the discoveries that were made in the beliefs and morals of the people. The preaching was irreproachably orthodox, the liturgy was exactly read, the creed regularly signed; but the most part of the "faithful" pastors that the Church had recruited, had no flock before them; a number of places of worship remained empty, while public-houses were full; and to remedy this state of things such men as Krummacher, Hengstenberg and Stahl, being consulted in relation to the matter, could recommend nothing else than to send a swarm of young missionaries, who should preach from house to house the faith, "such as it is professed in our Church—faith in Christ as God, and in the Scripture as containing the Word of God in every page." During the momentary calm which followed the reaction of 1849, politics, left on one side, no longer played the same part in the anti-christian warfare. But the scientific spirit had, in all its provinces, and specially in that of the natural sciences, made new progress in Germany. Its tendency,

always more marked toward unity, was adverse to the dualism of the reigning theology. The violent opposition had ceased, but the ancient objections were not removed, and new objections arose, so that there resulted a state of permanent antagonism between science and faith.

Modern discoveries have led men of science to recognize that most natural forces, which had been considered as separate, are identical; that electricity, magnetism, heat, light, are only varieties of the general phenomenon of movement, which itself, according to some, is only a result of the aggregation of matter. If then, they infer, on one side force is inseparable from matter, and if, by general consent, nothing in matter or force is ever lost—if the two are immortal, they are also infinite and eternal, and then where is the need of an agent external to them for their creation?

In the degree, it was also said, in which physiology and pathology progress, the intimate union of mind and body, the constant action they exert on one another, manifest themselves by phenomena even more striking. Why then distinguish them? Why should not the same forces which impress movement on matter produce the operations of mind? Why should not thought, like the other functions of our being, be a product of our organs, the effect of nervous electricity, for instance, or a secretion of the brain? The facts unfolded by Geology and Paleontology shew us life developing itself successively and in a manner constantly more perfect over the globe in the degree in which its surface is modified. Why should not the first appearance of life on the earth be also the result of a simple combination of matter favourable to that appearance? Finally, on seeing always more clearly the more deeply you penetrate into the research of causes, natural facts, as well as those of history--the revolutions of the globe, as well as those

of empires, engender each other, succeed each other as by a kind of mathematical necessity, why seek an external cause which presides over these movements and determines their succession? While waiting for these objections to be answered, as we shall see that they have been, by a more rigorous examination, the persistent vivacity with which they were reproduced shews us how religion was suffering in the world of Science. In England, similar speculations ardently pursued gave birth to the same negations. At an early day Pantheism had brilliant interpreters in Byron and his friend Shelley. After them, idealistic scepticism was introduced from Germany. The Positivist theories of Comte have, owing to the turn of the national mind, found there more adherents than in France. Another sect, already powerfully organized, has recently been born there, having for its object the destruction of the Established Church and that of the actual political order. Its doctrine, known under the expressive name of Secularism, teaches men to break with every religious idea in order to limit themselves to this world. To extract all that is possible from our present life is the sole morality it acknowledges. The census of 1851 already shewed in the lower classes of England an almost complete desertion of public worship, an almost total absence of religious habits. But the evil spread more widely. A materialistic book, published in 1828, spread in a short time to the number of 80,000 copies. About the same time there was formed in London a society of Atheists, under the name of "Free-thinkers." In the year 1851, the publications in English in which Atheism was professed were estimated at 600,000 volumes; the principal places where they were read were the universities and the manufacturing districts.

America herself, notwithstanding the glory of its revival

meetings, is far from being free from this contagion; witness the club of Atheists organized in Washington under the title of "Philosophic Lycæum."

In Russia, the reign of Catharine had left germs of scepticism which the revival of 1812 seemed for a moment to have destroyed, but which re-appeared as soon as the religious zeal of Alexander grew cold. This might have been anticipated on seeing the worldly luxury displayed by the nobility in the first assemblies of the Bible Society. In the measure in which the Czar grew indifferent to his work, the number of subscriptions rapidly grew less; fashion and flattery had occasioned more than a moiety of the success. As to the reign of Nicholas, it was, according to the historians, "a period of spiritual death which had its rebound in a state of agitation as dangerous for religion as for the political institutions." The rites of the Church were punctually observed, but under a complicated ritual was hidden an entire absence of faith; German Pantheism, and even hostility to Christianity, were propagated by lodges of Freemasons, not only among the workpeople, among whom were thousands of Nihilists, but also in the upper classes, and in even the bosom of the clergy. "In our days," says a publicist, "there has arisen in Russia an extreme democratic party which calls to their aid, while giving them a new impulse, the irreligious doctrines and passions which have long fermented in that country. Materialism, Atheism, Nihilism, after having been in a sporadic state in Russian society, have become there an epidemic, which specially pervades the middle class, takes its impulses from the books of naturalistic Atheists, and invades morals as well as literature. Two of its periodicals, the most widely circulated, have been suppressed as attacking marriage, the family and *property*, and preaching Atheistic communism openly.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN PROGRESS.

The excesses of irreligion may doubtless, with some men, have no other cause than voluntary blindness, depravation of character, or disorderly morals. But when, at the beginning of a religious and Christian age, Atheism comes of a sudden and infects numerous classes, more general causes alone can explain a fact so contrary to the natural instincts of humanity. The invasion of Atheism at certain periods is then a symptom, which the friends of religion should seriously study. It is an admonition which invites them to inquire what there is in its present state, in the direction which it takes, in the influences to which it is subject, that claims correctives and remedies.

On this point illusion is impossible. While observing the powerlessness of so many efforts to bring back to Christianity the generality of men of our time, in beholding the scepticism, the materialism of the last century revive in this under new forms, it has been wisely asked whether in the labour of Christian restoration, ardently undertaken in our days, the most intelligent and efficacious methods have been pursued; whether excess was not often combated by contrary excess; whether the materials employed were always sufficiently examined; whether the doctrines, the usages, the institutions sought to be esta-

blished, were the truest and the best; whether all legitimate liberties were respected; whether all essential truths were respected; whether, finally, the means employed, suitable possibly in other times, were the most appropriate to the wants of the present day. Such is the problem which has been put by sincere friends of Christianity; and the result of that inquiry, loyally pursued in the midst of the anathemas of the retrograde spirit and the sarcasms or the acts of violence of the subversive spirit, has been a movement of progress, which we are about to follow out under the three heads of Liberty, Truth, Religious Life.

I.

PROGRESS IN LIBERTY.

§ 1.

WHATEVER obstacles the retrograde tendencies have hitherto opposed, and oppose still, to the enfranchisement of consciences, it cannot be denied that veritable progress has been effected in this important matter. The general movement of the century, mingling together the populations of different countries, obliges them each to grant within their limits the just rights of which they claim the enjoyment for themselves. The treaties of commerce, on which depends so much the prosperity of states, bring with them treaties of reciprocal free institutions. The means of intercommunication, by multiplying voyages, favouring emigrations, and facilitating the exchange of ideas, dissipate dogmatical prejudices, and gradually tend to abrogate the old laws of intolerance.

These positions are illustrated in the new cantonal constitutions decreed in Switzerland from 1830 and 1847, and

which will probably be completed shortly in the reforms projected in the Federal Constitution. In the kingdom of Hanover, an ordinance published in 1824 put an end to all difference between the dominant and the tolerated religion. In England, access to Parliament, opened to the Catholics by the abolition of the Test Act, had been the previous year conceded to the Nonconformists, and the same liberality has since opened to both admission to degrees in the Oxford and Cambridge Universities. In Sweden, religious liberty, long refused to the Catholics by the union of the clergy, the nobility and the peasants, has partially triumphed by the concurrence of the King and the citizens. The new Constitution of Denmark has also guaranteed to all religious parties liberty of conscience.

In Russia, the toleration of Alexander I., so little imitated by his first successor, has been better observed by the next. Alexander II. bestowed religious liberty on the sect called Rascolnikes, at least on the most moderate of them. He has opened his states to the missionaries of different societies, and re-established the missions for the Caucasus. Finally, while maintaining the ancient law touching children born of mixed marriages, and forbidding all attempts to make proselytes among his Greek subjects, he has granted full liberty of conscience to the members of the different Christian communions, moderated the zeal of his bishops for the conversion of the Lutherans, and finally, it is said, removed the old civil penalties in case of abjuration, so that a Russian may become a Catholic or Protestant without thereby losing his titles to nobility or his rights of citizenship (1866). Even Catholic countries open gradually to the same progress. It was at this price that in Belgium the Ultramontane party in 1830 purchased the

co-operation of the liberals on behalf of the revolution which freed the country from the domination of Holland, and the efforts it has made since to take the liberty from them by indirect means and appropriate its benefit entirely to themselves, have been defeated by the union of the independent party.

In Italy, the era of religious liberty opened in 1848 by the emancipation of the Vaudois of Piedmont, which was soon, by a new statute, extended to all the Protestants of the kingdom (1850). Each of the annexations by which that kingdom completed itself in the sequel has given a new extension to those liberties, which now are nearly as complete as in any country of Europe, though troubled here and there, as in 1866 was seen in the small town of Barletta, by clerical and popular fanaticism. In Austria, the fatal issue of the battle of Sadowa made the government reflect (1866) on the little profit it had drawn from its Concordat of 1855 with Rome. Italy, against which that treaty was directed, formed a league with Prussia; the Protestant populations of the empire, Hungary among others, could serve a power hostile to their liberties only against its will; even the Pope and the clergy had but moderately supported Austria in the struggle. By a just return, the Austrian Concordat, without being expressly annulled, as had been those of Baden and Würtemberg, was annulled in fact in 1870, and in a more effective manner in 1873, by laws protecting liberty, which the ministers valiantly supported. Spain, since her revolution of 1868, has attempted, as much as her condition of perpetual anarchy has allowed, to enter on the same road. Her American colonies had entered thereon for the most part since their separation from the mother country.

Frequently, however, have they deviated therefrom, except Brazil, where religious liberty seems to have struck the deepest roots.

§ 2.

Moreover, it is a widely-extended opinion at the present hour that religious liberty cannot be entire so long as the religious order continues united with the civil; under this conviction Samuel Vincent and Alexander Vinet and many others, in their pleas for liberty of conscience, have maintained the necessity of rigorously separating the Church from the State.

This position, nevertheless, although supported by the example of the United States of America, whose influence on the old continent has not ceased to grow in our age, has indeed been introduced and discussed in several legislative assemblies, but has triumphed over the obstacles which stand in its way but imperfectly as yet. In Russia, where in the spirit of the people, as that of the Government, nationality is closely united with the profession of the Greek religion, this separation is at present absolutely impossible. In Catholic states, it is from the clergy specially that the opposition comes. It pretends, and it has solemnly declared by the Bishop and the Council of Rome, that the civil power has no more imperative duty, no more glorious mission, than to sustain by all its resources the Church, that column of the truth. Now, as long as governments shall accept that mission, it will be difficult for Protestants, even the most disposed to renounce the patronage of the State, to leave to their adversaries the exclusive enjoyment of that privilege. To these obstacles add those which come from habits so deeply rooted, bonds contracted so long since, which even in America were broken only by exceptional circumstances; add also the difficulties attached to the division

and application of old ecclesiastical foundations; and you will understand that the desired separation, in the most diverse camps, among religious men as well as free-thinkers, find as many adversaries as partizans, and down till now has been effected but very partially, as we have seen, in the new secession of Churches in Scotland, and in the formation of the free Churches of France and Switzerland.

The recent separation of the Protestant Church of Ireland has more importance, because it is the State itself which has undertaken to carry it into effect. Doubtless there was in this case an old and notorious injustice to repair, and for England a serious peril to put an end to. Profound and inveterate hatreds, acts of rebellion ceaselessly returning, a permanent agitation, long kept up with the aid of the clergy by the celebrated demagogue O'Connell, and accompanied by threatening demands for the repeal of the Union (1809), the general refusal of tithes, secret machinations organized against the tithe collectors (1831)—such were the sad effects of the religious situation of Ireland. The palliatives to which recourse was had remained generally without success. Neither the admission of the Catholics to Parliament, nor the alleviation of the tithe system, nor the foundation of colleges specially Irish (1838), nor the ample endowment of Maynooth for the instruction of the clergy, had succeeded in overcoming the national antipathy. When, after the emigration which followed the famine of 1847, legions of Protestant missionaries were sent into the country, their pastoral instructions, their open-air preachings, produced less edification than scandal. Finally, the new agitation caused by the Irish Fenians (1865) returning in a mass from the service of South America, and with them the return of scenes of revolt and violence, made the English Govern-

ment feel that the time was come for trying on that excitable people the virtue of a great act of justice. On the proposition of the Prime Minister Gladstone, and with determined opposition in the House of Lords, it was decided that, dating from the year 1871, the revenue of the ancient capital enjoyed by the Irish Protestant Church should be all but totally appropriated to beneficent and educational institutions on behalf of the country, and that in future the newly-elected Protestant ecclesiastics, as well as their worship, should be supported by their Church itself. A similar measure was, the preceding year (1870), adopted by the colonial Churches of Canada, Australia, and Jamaica. As to the separation declared in Mexico by the constitutional decree of the 6th of October, 1873, the sequel will shew to what point it may be considered as definitive.

If these are till now the only instances of an effective rupture between the religious and civil order, it must be admitted that there is in Europe a general tendency in that direction. The more intimate mixture of populations of different origin, consequently the simultaneous presence of worships increasingly more numerous and more diverse, the religious divisions continually going on in the degree in which convictions become more individual, separations such as those which are on the point of taking place as a consequence of the Vatican Council and the Synod of Paris, every day increase the difficulty of the task of governments charged to protect and support forms of religion, and promote more and more the efforts of the adversaries of national churches. On another side, in the degree in which religious life and spirit of association make increase, the different worships, more in a condition to suffice for themselves, renounce more willingly support

from the State. On all sides the influence of these different causes already manifests itself. During now half a century, in most European states, each political convulsion breaks some bonds existing with religious society, and the ensuing restorations try in vain to renew them with some solidity. Neither the Ultramontane theory of "the Catholic State," nor that of "the Christian State" upheld by some jurists of Germany, has succeeded in gaining acceptance. More and more, even in Catholic states, civil marriage is reputed sufficient in the eyes of the law; the trial of causes touching marriage and divorce is taken from the ecclesiastical tribunals; worships, where there are several, are restricted to celebrate their ceremonies only in the interior of their sacred edifices. The Church imposts abolished, the ancient religious foundations, those of Italy in particular, progressively taken possession of by the governments, are converted into an annual salary for the clergy. Nearly everywhere the official budget for worship tends to lessen, and you can catch a glance of the moment when it will be definitively cut off. This is a situation which the Churches, as long as their just independence is respected, are not bound to accelerate, but for which they cannot too soon prepare, by habituating themselves to rely on their own resources, and which they ought, when the moment is come, to accept frankly, considering what they will gain thereby in legitimate influence. In effect, although legally separated, civil society and religious society will not on that account be insulated one from another. By the sole fact of their co-existence, they may effectively aid each other; the one by diffusing religious principles, the guardians of public morality; the other by maintaining external order, necessary for the peaceful and harmonious development of the religious spirit. And these mutual

services they will render more effectually the more liberal they become. The minister of religion being no longer supported by the government, will appear in his veritable part all the more; being no longer a servant of the civil power, he will be the better heeded by his flock when he shall remind them of their duties as citizens. He will persuade the more readily when he shall possess no authority to constrain, and will be an auxiliary of peace and good, the less suspected and the more effective, when no political character belongs to him.

§ 3.

But the most considerable advantage that we may promise ourselves, and which we already gather from the gradual separation of the civil and religious order, is the appeasement of the conflicts, formerly so frequent, between the authorities that preside over this one and that. In the degree in which we approach the American system, those authorities, each more free in its own sphere, are less liable to oppose each other by their mutual exigencies, and to come into collision owing to their mutual pretensions. The same independence that has been secured for themselves by the fractions of churches which of their own accord have renounced pay from the State, and all other protection than that of the police, equal for all forms of worship, the salaried national churches have partially acquired by gradually parting with their ancient privileges. The Protestant communities, in their origin almost entirely subordinated to the civil authority, are to-day less constrained in their internal administration; the State is satisfied with the right of confirming the choice of the ecclesiastics which they put at their head, and in general abstain from taking cognizance of the doctrines, the forms of worship,

the creeds that they adopt, so long as there is nothing in them directly contrary to public order. The Catholic Church itself, deprived of the influence given it by its exorbitant wealth in former days, is now the object of a less jealous supervision on the part of governments. In France, most of the articles of 1682 are allowed to sleep; the *placets*, the appeals against abuses, fall more and more into disuse. In Italy, the clergy, less richly endowed, has become more free in its movements. No longer are prayers for the monarch required for it, nor *Te Deum* in honour of the statute; it blesses only what it chooses to bless, and refuses the sacrament at its own pleasure; since it has lost the right to constrain the conscience of others, its own conscience has ceased to be violated. Everywhere this progress would be still more manifest, had not Pius IX., like the Popes of old, constituted himself the judge of the civil and political administration of princes, if he had not found a council to sanction his pretensions, and bishops ready to carry them into effect. To these rash encroachments we have seen some governments obliged to oppose the ancient hindrances, and this will continue until they have recourse to the solely efficacious guarantee—namely, *that of separation.* But already we see a remarkable contrast. At the moment when Pius IX. obtained recognition of his divine right to govern peoples and kings, he finds himself deprived of the government of his own states, fallen from the throne which he recovered in 1849; in a word, stript of the temporal power which he persists in regarding as the firmest support of his pontifical authority. Let us stop for a moment or two on this memorable catastrophe. The general movement of secularization whence it proceeds, dates in Europe from the first decline of feudalism; it took a new flight at the epoch of the

Reformation; the French Revolution made it still more decided. In France, in Italy, the bishoprics, the abbeys, the chapters, lost with their old domains the feudal rights that were attached to them; the ecclesiastical electorates of Trèves, Cologne and Mayence, were destroyed, and their territories united to France (1800); those of the ecclesiastical principalities of Germany served to indemnify the lay princes for their losses during the war. In Switzerland, the act of mediation despoiled of its possessions the abbey of Saint-Gall for the benefit of the neighbouring cantons (1803), and all these secularizations were ratified in the Congress of Vienna (1814). In what concerned the Roman States, the allied powers did not think themselves able to pursue the same course. To render the sovereign Pontiff of the Catholic world subject to one of these powers, would then have appeared not so much, as has been said, to constrain his spiritual liberty, as to give to the prince who had him under his sway a considerable advantage, in particular too preponderant in Italy. It was judged specially necessary to keep that country separate, as it had been of old, and to prevent the formation of that Italian unity which the neighbouring states, when they could not seize its reins, as did Napoleon I., have always professed to fear. In re-establishing in their provinces the petty Italian princes, they equally restored (1814) to the Popes their sovereignty in the ancient patrimony of Saint Peter. But under the exclusive sacerdotal administration which immediately established itself there, under the load of the abuses which it revived, under the apprehension of the foreign despotism to which it lent its favour, Rome and Italy soon became a permanent focus of plots and troubles which threatened the tranquillity of all Europe. In vain the powers disquieted addressed to the Pontiffs their repre-

sentations and their advice; to all the requests for administrative reforms in the Roman States they replied either by promises which they never kept, or by purely illusory changes. The situation, already very strained under Leo XII. and under Pius VIII., appeared intolerable from the time of Gregory XVI., whose pontificate, coinciding with the then recent fall of the Bourbons in France, kindled revolution in Italy, and twice obliged the Austrian troops to occupy it. Accordingly, at Gregory's death, France, by the ascendancy which it was allowed to obtain in the Conclave, appointed (1846) Cardinal Mastai Pope, who passed for a declared friend of reforms. The Italian national party, who knew his weak side, flattering his vanity and profiting by his inexperience, finally profiting by the revolutions which broke out otherwheres, extracted from him by their laudations and their menaces, turn and turn about, acts of extreme liberalism, until the day when they solicited him to put himself at the head of a crusade against foreign domination. Before the threats of Austria the Pontiff was compelled to stop; but the radical party continued to advance toward their object by the assassination of the minister Rossi and the proclamation of the Roman republic. In the war which followed (1849), Austria, already victorious over Piedmont, was about to occupy Rome, intending to occupy all Italy. France intervened; its troops seized Rome, led back thither Pius IX. from Gaeta, whither he had fled, and replaced him in his chair and on his throne. But soon what happened? That which several had predicted, and which everybody might have foreseen. The holy Father returned from exile cured, as may be believed, of his constitutional fancies,—the holy Father, from whom France had obtained promises of amnesty and reform, but whom from prudence it did not wish to constrain, profited

by his position to concede as little as possible. Looking favourably on France, he yet turned a deaf ear to its advice, while quietly but ceaselessly he laboured to bring the Austrians back into Italy.

France and Piedmont, threatened afresh, united their interests strongly, and that agreement, cemented by the war of the Milanais and the cession of Savoy, enabled Piedmont to achieve the conquest of northern Italy, and to annex to it the States of the Church on the east of the Apennines, to take from the Bourbons the possession of the two Sicilies, and thus to constitute the kingdom of Italy. Rome, with its immediate territory, nevertheless remained in the power of the Holy See (1864), and the government of Victor Emanuel had to promise to see it respected; but that engagement did not hold out long against the impatience of Italian liberals. After a fresh attempt, defeated by France, as soon as the latter withdrew its troops to direct them toward Berlin, they took possession of Rome (1870), and the capital of the Catholic world became the capital of the new Italian kingdom. Thus the domination of the prince bishops in Europe came to an end. Thus also, unless there arise new circumstances which many efforts tend to bring, but which will not prevent the definitive result, the movement of secularization which has gone on for several centuries, and which, after having successively reached all the ecclesiastical dignitaries, abbots, canons, bishops, has finally reached the supreme episcopate, and taken effect in the very centre of Catholicity.

In taking possession of Rome, the Italian Government had to assure Catholic consciences by the most extensive guarantees given for the maintenance of the spiritual liberty of the holy Father. By him they are repelled; he hopes to bring a favourable issue in imitating Pius VII.,

by playing the part of a prisoner, which in his case is somewhat fictitious. Without doubt, it is a strange mortification for the King-Pontiff to lose one of his crowns at the moment when the other had been surrounded with a new lustre. But by a little attention he may, perhaps, discover the necessary and fatal connection that there is between these two events. Perhaps, also, in going over in the annals of the primitive Church the glorious history of Clement, Fabian, Cornelius, Leo and Gregory I., he, or at least his successors, will understand all that the Pontificate, in ceasing to be a royalty, may gain in dignity and liberty in the spiritual order.

§ 4.

If the relations between religious and civil authority tend to improve under the progressive separation of the domains over which they preside, the progress of religious liberty does not exercise a less happy influence on the mutual relations of the different Christian communions. In the degree in which governments, better understanding their part as moderators, shew themselves more firmly decided not to allow any inoffensive religious society to be oppressed—in the degree in which each communion feels its rights more equitably, more loyally guaranteed, controversies lose their bitterness, mutual animosities are composed. To-day, moreover, when almost everywhere, with the material barriers between nations, the moral barriers between worship sink and disappear, the designations of Catholic and Protestant states, by which the old continent and the new were divided at the commencement of this century, lose day after day their signification; nearly all become in reality, if not yet in name, mixed states. In such circumstances it will be difficult to put

into fermentation again the passions of another age, to rekindle religious wars, or to gain for the suggestions of a narrow confessionalism preponderance over the large ideas of country and humanity. Does it follow that the Greek, Latin and Protestant communions are ready to become one? Certainly not. Too many causes, proceeding from diversities of country, original, national genius, political circumstances, still keep them apart. Although disarmed, the parties are not reconciled; no one of them has renounced making conquests to the prejudice of the others. But despoiled, though still incompletely in certain lands, of their previous means of constraint, they are obliged to recur, and recur in fact, to the more legitimate ways offered to them by liberty itself. It is thus that Catholicism, under the ægis of these liberal principles, which are dear to it wherever it does not yet bear sway, introduces in crowds into Protestant countries its missionaries, its institutions, founds there churches and chapels, where it displays as publicly as it can its pomps and its ceremonies. To support its proselytism, vast brotherhoods, founded in Paris, Lyons and other principal cities, collect every year considerable sums of money, which they distribute especially in countries whose conquest Rome desiderates. In France, the Societies of Saint François de Sales and Vincent de Saint Paul; in Germany, those of Saint Boniface, the Pius-Verein, &c., are so many aggregations devoted to a very active propagandism. That of Saint Vincent de Saint Paul among others, founded in Paris by Ozanam (1833) with solely eight sub-societies, counted more than thirty thousand thirty years afterwards. Their efforts tend specially to people, as much as possible, Protestant states with Catholic families, whose emigration, establishment and naturalization, they facilitate. Then, when these families have planted

their feet there in sufficient numbers, and when, by favour of universal suffrage, their heads have obtained a voice in the local or general councils, the Pope on his side retakes possession of the country, and dividing it into dioceses over which he sets bishops, without caring at first whether or not they are recognized by the governments, but in always reckoning on some happy opportunity to get them acknowledged. It is thus that in Holland, where the Catholics already form two-fifths of the population, Pius IX. has re-established the five bishoprics which existed there before the Reformation; that in England, where the Catholic population has increased by more than two millions, principally by the immigration of Irish labourers, he has instituted twelve bishops, who are dependent on an Archbishop of Westminster (1850). In the United States, where there was at first only one bishop, the Bishop of Baltimore, there are at present more than fifty, under the control of several archbishops, the last of whom has already founded three hundred churches. Finally, to confirm itself, whether in the old countries under its sway or in newly-obtained posts, the Catholic Church, with the aid of opulent families, founds there numerous religious houses, monastic or demi-monastic, devoted to works of piety or beneficence, and specially to education. Thither she draws and brings up children of poor families, and, availing herself of the feeling of want, attaches them closely to her service. Under the Second Empire, houses of the kind were multiplied, and became possessed of much property. By omitting examinations as to capacity, the monks and nuns who conduct these schools, and who have tripled in twenty years, have got into their hands the education of the half of the French youth. At the same time, for the daughters of opulent families, convents

or boarding-schools, conducted with a kind of luxury, were established, by means of which the female instruction, taken from domestic influence, passed into the hands of the clergy. Hence the violent opposition which Pius IX. and the bishops of France made to the League of Elementary Instruction, to the establishment of professional schools of women, of normal schools for lay female teachers, and especially to gratuitous public instruction, which would combat the clerical instruction with equal arms. The Protestants on their side did not remain idle. Although in Catholic states the new regime of liberty is for them restricted within narrower limits, they profit as much as they can by sending out their distributors of Bibles and religious tracts, their missionaries, their evangelists charged with establishing chapels and schools. Since the promulgation of the statute of Charles Albert, and specially since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy, the efforts of Protestantism have been exerted over this area. The Vaudois churches of Piedmont and different dissident churches, supported by England and America, maintain in nearly all the Italian cities evangelists and teachers, for the preparation of whom a Protestant academy has been founded in Florence. Recently a Bible Society has been established in Rome, as well as new evangelical chapels (1872). Of all the modern Protestant institutions, the Societies of Religious Aid for scattered Protestants seem to promise the surest and the most prolific results. Such are, for France and the neighbouring countries, the national and dissident Societies of Evangelization in the south and the east, of which that of Geneva is an auxiliary. Such is, for Germany, the great Society of Gustavus Adolphus, which, founded first in Sweden to celebrate the bisecular anniversary of that great monarch, two years later established

in Saxony, has since 1842 obtained immense extension, and despite the opposition and hindrances which it has long encountered, especially in Bavaria and Austria, has extended its ramifications throughout Germany, and within the space of twenty years increased its annual budget tenfold.

Already in many places, by the zeal of these associations there were formed old flocks which fanaticism had dispersed, old churches which had been destroyed, and which, with the schools that were connected with them, became in the midst of the Roman populations valuable centres of evangelization. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that, in regard to schools, Catholicism finds in its unmarried and unsalaried instructors an advantage against which Protestantism cannot struggle, except by a redoublement of zeal in its laymen, its pastors, and its directors. As to the other means of propagandism, they have profited differently to the two parties. If Protestantism tends to gain ground, and in truth does gain ground, among the friends of free inquiry, and among those who wish to escape from the clerical yoke, Catholicism on its side makes its way among those who, seeking before all in religion a source of authority, complain that they find in Protestant communities, even the more stationary, what can hardly be called authority, since it is too uncertain and vacillating. Such was, in the first half of this century, the consideration which led to certain apostasies—for instance, those of Stolberg, Hurter, Adam Müller, Schlosser, De Haller, Newman, and, more recently, of a part of the nobility of England and Scotland. Those of the poets Tieck, Werner, and of the painter Winklemann, had their origin rather in the love of the fine arts and the Romanticism of the period. In general, however, these passings from one of the camps

into the other are comparatively rare in these times. As long as the two parties are in conflict, a kind of point of honour, joined to a thousand personal proprieties, domestic or social, keeps each individual under his old flag. The civil registers, in classing citizens according to their baptism, also contribute to fixing persons in the communion in which they were born. Up to now, it is less by conversions properly so called than by infiltrations of new populations that the two rival communions increase in each place the number of their adherents. Opposite currents incessantly carry Protestants into Catholic countries, and Catholics into Protestant countries. While Ireland peoples with poor and ignorant hand-workers the manufacturing districts of England, Scotland and North America, wealthy Scotchmen purchase in Ireland hereditary lands, recently alienated or abandoned by the emigrants, and people them with industrious Protestant farmers and day-labourers. While in Catholic countries the learned professions, high commercial and manufacturing positions, are more and more occupied by Protestant foreigners, in Protestant lands foreign Catholics come in a crowd to exercise mechanical pursuits. All things being equal, however, as in the long run the advantage sooner or later turns inevitably to the side of knowledge and civilization, Protestantism, as well as the sections of Catholicism which begin to approach those blessings, seems to have for itself the most favourable prospects.

The countries in which Ultramontanism bears rule are at present in a state of incontestable inferiority. Now for a long time Spain has lost its part on the stage of Europe, and from the bosom of anarchy by which it is devoured does not seem likely to regain it. Austria, since Sadowa, has descended from the high rank which it occupied some

years ago; it is on the fidelity of its Hungarian subjects that henceforward it sees itself obliged to reckon. Germany more and more circulates around Prussia, which by its recent annexations has gained many millions of Protestant subjects. Since 1847, Switzerland has its centre of activity in its Evangelical cantons. England and the States of North America hold in the two oceans the sceptre of maritime commerce; their missions, more productive than those of Catholicism, prepare for Protestantism new conquests. Who, finally, does not foresee in America itself new invasions of the Northern States into the Southern? For the moment, if we may trust the statistical tables, Catholicism still reckons on the globe a number of adherents double of that which belongs to Protestantism (150 to 170 millions against 70 to 80). But in the majority there undoubtedly are a much larger number of indifferentists, who belong to it only by the hazard of birth and the rite of baptism. This indifference, however, appears less to be regretted than might be supposed. The Church has learned to resign itself to it, for it finds therein one of the best preservatives against apostasy. "Those indifferentists," says M. Quinet, "prefer keeping their ancient religion to laugh at it when they like, while the crowd worships it. To change religion, they say, is a serious business, and we have too much sense for that." Thus speak those who care nothing about religion, and the Church lets them have their say, knowing well when she shall one day recover them. Each of the two communions thus preserves its own advantages, and it is not probable that, at least for a long time, the one will succeed in supplanting or absorbing the other. Still less under their old form are they likely to blend together. But what may be foreseen, and that of which this sketch shews several symptoms, is a kind of "natural selection"

which, taking place in the midst of the gradual decomposition of old parties, will bring together and group minds according to the affinity of their religious tendencies, and for the old confessional distinctions others will be substituted which will better correspond to the real state of beliefs. Awaiting this transformation, let us again acknowledge the happy influence which the progress of religious liberty has already exercised on the real state of men's opinions. Under a regimen which more efficaciously guarantees the maintenance of their rights, their proselytism, kept within legitimate bounds, takes a happier direction, that of an emulation, which, multiplying in each country religious associations, turns entirely to the increase of zeal. Then, even in the midst of the rivalries which keep them apart, Catholics and Protestants, approaching each other, become mutually acquainted, and so understand and appreciate their several qualities as to make what is general predominate over what is particular, and to shew to each children of God in both. Wherever there are common dangers to encounter, sufferings to mitigate, a common country to defend, shades of religious difference are forgotten, each feels a man's heart beat in himself, for which everything human is dear and sacred.

§ 5.

After having presented in a general manner the progress of religious liberty, and noticed the influence of it on the relations of State and Church, and on those of the different Christian communions, it remains for us to inquire how in each of them it has modified the internal constitutions of the different churches, substituted in these the aristocratic government for the monarchic, and in those for the latter a government inclining more and more to the democratic,

and which finally gives to the laity a part more or less considerable in the direction of general religious interests.

1. In the Middle Ages, the monarchical constitution was that of the Eastern Churches as well as those of the West. The Patriarch of Constantinople held under his pastoral crook the orthodox Greek churches, as the Pope of Rome held the Catholic churches of the Latin rite. After the capture of Constantinople had rendered the Patriarch of that city subject to the Turks, he saw the body of the Russian Church, which had passed under the domination of the Metropolitan of Moscow, progressively detach itself and separate from him, until it was finally subjected by Peter the Great to a union of prelates named the "Holy Synod" (1723). Other Greek Churches followed in our own age the example of the Russian Church. From the time when Greece freed itself from the Ottoman yoke (1821), the Hellenic Church would no longer recognize for its spiritual head the nominee of the Sultan; it broke the bonds which united it to the Patriarch of Byzantium, and in an assembly held at Nauplia resolved (1833), while remaining faithful to the ancient symbols of orthodoxy, to own no other spiritual head than Jesus Christ, no other temporal governor than the King, who was to direct it according to the sacred canons by a permanent synod of bishops and archbishops. The Patriarch, after some resistance, ended by consenting to this separation (1850). The Ionian isles, since their annexation to the kingdom of Greece, submitted to the new Hellenic Synod. Servia, since its enfranchisement by the treaty of Adrianople, gave itself a head in an independent Metropolitan (1830). The Danubian provinces, half emancipated from the Turkish domination, followed the example of Russia and Greece (1865), renounced the authority of the Patriarch, and recognized that of the Synod

of bishops and metropolitans. Bulgaria did the same, except ten villages previously converted by Catholic missionaries (1869); and notwithstanding the opposition of the Bishop of Constantinople, the Sultan ratified that separation. If you understand the displeasure of the Greek Patriarch in seeing the churches which during so many centuries acknowledged his supremacy, detach themselves from him one after another, you will wonder at the presumption of the Roman Pontiff, who, on the point of convening the Council in which his infallibility was to be pronounced, invited, as the head of the universal Church, the Patriarch of Constantinople and the other bishops of the East to come to Rome to abjure their pretended schism; the Armenians, the Copts, and the Maronites, united to renounce the liberty of their elections and the other immunities which had been previously acknowledged; and finally the Protestants (whom as heretics he did not condescend to call to an assembly of believers) to declare their return into the Church from which, three centuries ago, their fathers had maliciously separated. To these summonses the Protestants replied—these, by a peremptory refusal—others, more suitably, by the silence of disdain. The Patriarchs of the East reminded the Pope, who forgot it, of the primitive dignity of their sees, equal to that of the See of Rome; the Armenians of Constantinople replied by the complete rupture of their union and the nomination of an independent Patriarch recognized by the Porte; finally, the Maronites, by a threat of separation which has been on the point of accomplishment. But greater vexations awaited Pius IX. In getting himself recognized as the Sovereign and Infallible Head of the entire Church, he forgot the spirit of independence which in all ages had nestled in the churches of Germany, the first explosion of which was

marked by the schism of Luther; he forgot the new symptoms by which the same spirit had made itself anticipated in our age—the boldness of university science, the petitions of the German clergy against celibacy, the concert of protests raised by the exhibition of the sacred tunic of Trèves, the reiterated appeals for the foundation of a German Church. The Roman Council, in thinking it should for ever stifle these troublesome voices, only made them burst forth all at once. To the renewed pretensions of the Popes of the Middle Ages, they to-day set in opposition the authority of the universal Church, which in the most ancient times had depended only on the body of the bishops, or, better still, on Jesus Christ alone. On nearly all the points of Germany, even in Bavaria, in Silesia, in Rhinan Prussia, in the mixed cantons of Switzerland, and even in some purely Catholic countries, separate associations are formed under the name of "Ancient Catholics," or "Liberal Catholics." The professors, the governors, the parish priests, excommunicated by their bishops, are supported by public opinion and maintained in their functions by the civil authority, which recognizes the equality of their rights to the protection and support of the State. Let us not anticipate as to the future of a religious movement which as yet is only in its birth, and to which, moreover, we shall shortly have occasion to return. Let us merely add, that it was under such auspices that in Germany and in Switzerland the Reformation of the sixteenth century declared itself.

2. While in the old Greek and Latin Churches the ecclesiastical monarchy underwent these partial checks, in the Protestant Churches it was the aristocratic constitution. The kings of Prussia had at an early day, it is true, the thought of establishing the episcopal regime in

the churches of their states. This thought was present in the negociations of Frederick William I. with the Archbishop of Canterbury for the union of the Churches of England and Prussia. Under the influence of the reactionary ideas of the restoration, Frederick William III. in 1816 instituted two bishops, one for Berlin, the other for Königsberg; in 1829, he named for each province general superintendents, to whom for some time the title of bishops was given, and any way a considerable increase of authority. The co-operation of his son in the erection of the Anglo-Prussian bishopric of Jerusalem (1841), independently of the projects which attached to it for the protection of Christian interests, had also for object to familiarize his subjects with the episcopal administration. But that same year, public opinion, which it was thus sought to influence, manifested itself in a manner so formal against this form of government, that the King thought he ought to renounce the project. To-day public opinion in Germany speaks more and more strongly in favour of the synodical regime. Its friends see in it the means not only of uniting the two communions more effectually, and to remove the Church from the authority of governments, but also to give more development to ecclesiastical and religious life. The governments themselves, after attempting to maintain their ancient rights and those of their consistories, have begun to understand the difficulty of the enterprize, and prefer saving their responsibility by putting their authority into the hands of the representatives of the Church. It is this which determined Eichhorn, a disciple of Schleiermacher, to introduce into the united Church of his states the synodical regime promised in 1817, but which was not established till 1835 in the new provinces of the Rhine and of Westphalia. The convoca-

tion of the provincial synods, constituted in 1844 in the provinces of the East, then that of the general synod of Berlin in 1846, were the consequence of this new resolution. The efforts of the liberal Protestant Union (Reform-Verein), convoked in these last years (1866) in different cities, tend in a measure to spread this new form of Church administration everywhere, while profiting for that end by the progressive unification of the Germanic body, and the Prussian Government has just deferred to this desire (1873) in what concerns the six provinces of its monarchy.

3. In face of the ultra-Lutheran party, obstinate to maintain intact the regime most favourable to the exclusive authority of the clergy, the establishment of synods constitutes a step in advance assuredly considerable. Otherwheres, however, especially in the Dissenting communities, it does not appear yet to reply sufficiently to the democratic aspirations of our times, and the same reasons which more and more make the Presbyterian form prevail in Protestant states, tend in America, and even among the English Dissenters, to make the Congregationalist or Independent form prevail over the Presbyterian. In America, the number of Independent congregations has prodigiously increased in our century. It has also increased in England, where in 1839 were nearly two thousand communities thus constituted, and where, among the Presbyterian churches themselves, a great number, from the lack of general synods to regulate their common interests, insensibly tend toward Congregationalism. In France, it is by other ways that in the nineteenth century the old Presbyterian regime takes the same direction. The Protestant churches, broken and almost dissolved during nearly 120 years of persecution, notwithstanding the courageous and persevering efforts of Antoine Court, did not

re-constitute themselves in a regular manner till under the Consulate, by the law of the 18th *Germinal*, in the year X (1802), but in losing their principal administrative machinery, the conferences, the provincial synods and the national synods. These were replaced by the Council of State, presided over by the Minister of Worship, and by a central Council of twelve members serving as an intermediary between the Church and the Government. There remained then no ecclesiastical authority properly so-called except that of the great Consistories, presiding each one over a Protestant population of about six thousand souls.

This ecclesiastical organization did not appear sufficient for a Church which its past attached to the Presbyterian form of government. It requested the re-establishment of provincial and national synods, which was finally granted, but whose constitution, at least in the project which prevailed in the Synod of Paris (1872), seems to guarantee but imperfectly an equitable representation of parishes, as well as the different parties which divide the Church of France. It would be sad to see this regime, called for in Germany in a spirit of union and progress, constitute itself in France with opposite views. As to the relations of the laity with the clergy, if in the national churches the excesses of *Darbyism* are to be little feared, if they are little disposed to charge the laity with functions of the ministry properly so called, far from falling into the opposite extreme, that of sacerdotalism, they tend rather, with some exceptions, to render the action of the ecclesiastical ministry less exclusive, and to make the flock interpose more directly in the government of the Church. They judge with reason, in certain respects, that the laity will interest themselves so much the more in religious matters, if they consecrate thereto their time and care. Thus, independently of the

institution of deacons, destined to aid the pastors in the administration of the parishes, especially in the direction of schools and the distribution of alms, the bodies charged with the general administration of the Church are to-day in the great majority composed of laymen. Nearly wherever universal suffrage has been introduced into the State, it has been into the Church : the consistories and the pastors, the bishops themselves, in the Anglican Church of Ireland, are appointed by the flock. In several cantons of Switzerland, the pastors are re-eligible by the flock at the end of some years. This is carrying democracy rather far. This clause of periodic re-election scarcely seems likely to encourage serious studies among the Protestant clergy. But in general we cannot contest the happy influence of a moderate Presbyterianism, in which the ecclesiastical authority is divided between the pastors and the members of the flock. In the consistories and the synods, while some are initiated more profoundly in religious things by the contact of men, who make it the subject of their habitual studies, others find in the control of lay voices a corrective of the dangerous privilege of speaking from the pulpit without being contradicted; the science of the one and the practical sense of the other thus mutually aid each other, and truth profits in every way by this exchange of light. But it is from the concurrence of many other causes, and, before all, from the increase and general diffusion of information, that we are to expect the progress of religious truth, the happy evolution by which it will by little and little disengage itself from the darkness into which retrograde tendencies and subversive passions emulously try to plunge it.

II.

PROGRESS IN TRUTH.

§ 1.

THE movement imprinted on men's minds by the Reformation of the sixteenth century was too energetic for any barrier, any restrictive law, to long arrest its flight. One step in advance soon led to others. One cannot suppose that the Reformers, notwithstanding their knowledge and their genius, embraced the entire truth at once; nor was the liberty which they enjoyed themselves interdicted to their successors. The creeds in which their doctrines were consigned were consequently soon subjected to a new examination. Different attempts were made to put them more in harmony with conscience, reason, and specially the gospel. Against the partial Augustinianism of Luther arose the semi-Pelagianism of Melancthon and his disciples; against the absolute Predestination of Calvin arose Arminianism; against Trinitarianism and the Christological doctrines borrowed from the ancient Councils arose the Arianism of Episcopius and the Unitarianism of Socinus; against the infallible authority ascribed to the entire Scripture arose the criticism of Cappel and Eichhorn, the rationalism of Kant and Semler; and these doctrines, despite strong opposition, fixed themselves in various faculties of theology, and penetrated even into the national clergy. Repelled again by the retrograde current of our age, as injurious to the cause of political and religious restoration, not only they did not succumb, but, ripened by deeper studies,

formulated with more elevation, as well as more exactitude and boldness, they every day gain new adherents.

Thus, although the preachings of the Scotch and Whitfieldian missionaries gave momentary vogue to the Calvinistic doctrines, the dogma of absolute predestination was too contrary to the universalism of the gospel; it too directly shocked the ideas admitted in most of the Protestant churches on the perfections and government of God, to easily take root therein. The Church of Geneva formally rejected it a century ago; the Churches of Vaud, of Neuchâtel, and the rest of Switzerland, those of France, had much mitigated it; the Lutherans, the Moravians, the Pietists, the greater number of Methodists, never admitted it. The logical rigour with which certain sectaries undertook to revive it, even so far as to teach the impeccability of disciples, completed its disrepute. The Whitfield chapels were soon eclipsed by those of the party of Wesley. The Confession of La Rochelle, the Canons of Dort, have no place but in history; the munificence of some Scotch patrons alone preserves in the Vaudois churches of Piedmont some remains of life in the Confession of 1655; and even in Holland, whence Arminianism had been at first so violently banished, it has for some time been in the ascendancy. Unitarianism, in the struggles which it had to maintain in the sixteenth and seventeenth century against orthodoxy, and in the eighteenth against anti-christian doctrines, had, like Arminianism, contracted an argumentative character more appropriate to the wants of controversy and defence than those of edification. It lacked that unction, or, as has been said, that grain of mysticism, necessary to a real religious influence. Such it shewed itself in England in Priestley and in Belsham. In the period of revival, its intellectualism passed for coldness, for

dryness, if not for lack of devotion. People went so far as to see in it an ally, an accomplice of French incredulity. It was denounced from the pulpit, and stigmatized even in Parliament; capital punishment, suppressed in 1792 in regard to other Dissenters, was down to 1813 maintained, though the law was a dead letter, against its followers; more Unitarians than one, Priestley among others, pursued by the popular animosity, were obliged to seek a refuge in America. But this was a salutary crisis for Unitarianism. It is with religious parties condemned to exile as with those vegetables which, carried by storms into distant climates, assume there new forms, colours and properties. The Baptist doctrine, Quakerism, thus carried into the New World, were there happily modified. In those countries, where the glorious founders of independence, in throwing off the yoke of England, at the same time threw off the yoke of Anglican prejudices and proclaimed religious liberty, Unitarianism underwent a still further transformation. A young ecclesiastic, whom we shall by and by meet with among the most eminent Christian philanthropists of our age, W. Ellery Channing, placed in Boston at the head of a Unitarian congregation (1803), infused into his preaching from the first a religious tone full of life and warmth. Far removed from the dry and dialectical method of the English Unitarian preachers, he kept himself, as far as he could, free from all party spirit, accepted that denomination only when he saw in it a title of unmerited reprobation, when on a given signal, which probably came from Great Britain, a revival of Puritan fanaticism suddenly declared itself in the United States. Seeing Unitarianism rejected from all congregational pulpits, denounced to the crowd as a system "impious, monstrous, let loose by Satan

for the ruin of souls," Channing thundered in his turn against the "Protestant Papism more irritating than that of Rome." With the gospel in his hands, he proved that the two favourite dogmas of orthodoxy, the deity of Christ and the expiation of sins by his blood, both injurious to the highest perfections of God, were unknown to Jesus himself. During fifteen years he maintained the struggle with firmness. But as soon as it was calmed, free henceforth to yield to the impulses of his heart, he occupied himself with feeding his flock with the sanctifying principles of Christianity, and with pressing the applications of it with the penetrating unction which characterizes his discourses and his writings in general. Preached with so much impressiveness, Unitarian Christianity took in America a rapid flight, the number of churches increasing every day. At a later time, a sojourn which Channing made in England and on the Continent, the valuable relations he there formed, the propagation of his works, the just renown which his social writings acquired, extended his influence far and wide, and thus there was formed in the two worlds a new Unitarian school, more bold than ancient, but also more attractive, more living, more prolific, the ascendancy of which, more and more marked even in the bosom of the National Churches, presents in Protestant dogma a new and considerable step in advance. What Church would now venture to propose to its members the rigid adoption of the old Trinitarian symbols, especially since the discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript (1863), as previously that of the Vatican, confirms the objections of old raised against those symbols, and justifies the Unitarian translators whom orthodoxy had accused of falsifying the sacred text?

§ 2.

In face of the plenary inspiration of the period of revival, the rationalism of certain schools of Germany had much to do to keep its position. On the traces of Ernesti, Semler, &c., Paulus, Eichhorn, Wegscheider, Roehr and Bretschneider, entered into the critical questions relative to the Scriptures;—in the Protestant point of view, nothing assuredly more legitimate, and for the teachers nothing more necessary. The moment that they refused the authority of the tradition of the Church, to substitute for it the absolute authority of the books which it had transmitted as fully inspired of God,—before proposing them, and especially before imposing them as such on the Christian world, it was necessary to make them the object of a serious examination; it was necessary, with all the scientific resources at their command, to ascertain the period, the author, the object, the true text, the true sense of each of them; to appreciate their contents; to apply those contents, in a word, as with all ancient documents, the general rules of criticism as bearing thereon. But in this labour of erudition and analysis, the theologian who gave himself to the task in an exclusive manner was easily accused, not only of failing in respect for the Bible, but also in drying up its vivifying sap and withering its poetic beauties. Already Herder, Jacobi and Lessing, in the name of sentiment and imagination, had protested against the aridity of this criticism. With more reason, the old literalism spoke out against it. The Protestant theologians of Germany at the beginning of this century were then still divided into two opposite camps, under the name of "Rationalist" and "Supranaturalist." While for the latter everything in the Bible was divine, and the intervention of God shewed

itself specially in the facts that were on the outside of nature there recounted, for the former it was, on the contrary, the presence of those narratives which damaged the authority of the Bible, and did not allow belief in divine inspiration except with reserve. All the activity of theologians then was employed in arguing for or against the reality of these supranatural allegations. Instead of collecting in this venerable monument of the faith of ancient days the treasures of edification and instruction which it contains, without denying and also without being astonished at the disparities which it presents with the ideas of our own time; instead specially of going directly to Jesus, of yielding themselves, as those who of old gathered round him, to the infinite charm of his words, of ingenuously opening their soul to his sacred exhortations, to his sympathetic appeals, they in their schools spent their time in discussing the degree of doctrinal authority, of natural or supranatural inspiration that ought to be ascribed to them. It was with both sides the same arid intellectualism which Priestley and his contradictors had been reproached with. It was time to have done with these sad and sterile debates. On one side there were results acquired to science, and which it could not repudiate without injuring faith itself—for faith is solid only as far as it takes possession of the entire men, and that which does not satisfy the intellect can hardly make its way to the heart; but, on another side, that which does not satisfy the intellect or penetrate the heart remains without influence on the life. The soul cannot live on pure negations. If the primitive Protestantism, certainly very negative in comparison with the Catholic theology, could have advantageously sustained the struggle, the reason is that it insisted more on what it affirmed than on what it denied; the reason is that it de-

stroyed only to build again with more solid materials. In this respect it was necessary to follow its example, to give in necessary measure satisfaction to the new wants of the time, and, leaving to science the free scope which the Reformation had impressed upon it, to give also free scope to the profound religious sentiment which had animated its authors. It was reserved for Schleiermacher to accomplish in Germany this double task, to conciliate by a theology appropriate to the genius of his nation the interests of faith and those of free inquiry. By the religious education which he had received among the Moravians, by the profound philosophical studies to which he afterwards gave himself up, by his eminent and admirably adjusted faculties, that illustrious theologian seemed in every respect prepared for the part he was about to play.

Appointed originally pastor at Berlin, where still reigned the frivolous incredulity imported from France under Frederick II., he addressed to "the instructed classes" (1799) his celebrated "Discourses," in which, combating the false ideas which kept them at a distance from religion, he shewed to them in it, not, as they had figured it, a dry nomenclature of theological dogmas or moral precepts, but a primitive and natural force inherent in the human soul, and which, although developing itself by reflection, and in its turn unfolding activity, thus embracing science and morality, is nevertheless neither the one nor the other, but has its seat in sentiment—that is to say, as he defined it, in the consciousness of our dependence on God and the universal order. This definition, though incomplete, since in it love has no place, human liberty is not formally expressed, and although the first developments which he gave of it are not exempt from a tinge of Pantheism inherited from Schelling, yet made a salutary impression on the classes to

which it was addressed, in indicating to them what was lacking in that intellectual culture of which they were so proud. At a later day (1810) called to profess theology in the newly-founded University in Berlin, in presence of the interminable controversy that was going on between rationalism and supernaturalism, Schleiermacher, dissatisfied with their want of breadth and elevation, espoused neither the one nor the other, nor offered himself as a reconciler of the two, making by turn concessions to both; but separating with a penetrating glance the essential from the accessory, displacing the question on which the endless combats proceeded, he took between the parties of his day that higher position which forms an epoch in the modern history of German theology. Nothing more uselessly prolongs discussions than questions badly put. Such, according to him, was the question which divided the theologians of his time. It was not "the supernatural," it was "the contra-natural," "the extra-natural," that was in question. The question was to decide if the Supreme Being, who possesses omniscience, in making man free, had been ignorant of the possible misuses of that liberty, and if to remedy them He was compelled, as a non-prescient artist, to overturn the admirable order of which he was Himself the author? This Schleiermacher could not admit. In Christianity, he said, everything is supernatural, as proceeding from the Infinite Being, superior to nature which He formed and governs; but at the same time everything is natural, as taking place by the natural agents of which He makes use in the execution of his designs. The sole question, consequently, which he admits in this matter is this, Is Christ for us the ideal of humanity? Is it he that we wish to resemble? Is it his impulse that we wish to follow, his spirit that we wish to breathe? On this ground, added Schleiermacher, supra-

naturalists or rationalists, all right-hearted men, will be of one mind. The true proof of Christianity then was not, according to him, either the argument more or less skilful of its apologists, or the value assigned to these testimonies or those. It lies altogether in "Christian experience," that is, in the sanctifying, regenerative impression experienced by every sincere soul in habitual communion with Jesus. Religion has its seat in the heart. This is the point to which we must ever refer. Just as there is in each man a religious sentiment, innate and instinctive, which leads him to rise and unite himself with the Infinite Being, so is there in every man born in a Christian country, brought up in a Christian communion, "a Christian consciousness," a reflection of the spirit of Christ with which his Church is penetrated, and which, developed by meditation and experience, unites him more and more to Christ, and through Christ to God, whose will, thus becoming his own, makes him a partaker of the peace which can be found only in Him. For a soul which enjoys this grace and this happiness, all other proof becomes superfluous. To this conclusive proof, external proofs, drawn from such or such facts, add nothing; but equally is it true that all the difficulties which may be raised against these proofs do not touch the faith which has its roots in such depths. This testimony which Christianity renders to itself in the intimate sanctuary of the soul, was thus, says Professor Dorner, "happily substituted for the arguments which the old supernaturalist arsenal borrowed from miracles and prophecies." Indeed, it was the decisive argument to which appeal was made by many a Father of the Church—by Luther, Calvin himself, Herder, Lessing—all the great souls. It is the victorious argument which brought his first disciples to the feet of Jesus. To believe in him they

needed neither his miraculous resurrection nor ascension; it was his own personality itself, the invincible attraction which he exercised over their souls, which, at a single word, made them follow in his train and share his labours and his cross. Not less peremptorily did Schleiermacher cut the gordian knot of plenary inspiration, which still held bound the rationalists themselves. The writings of the apostolic period, a source rich and indispensable for the Christian's instruction, did not constitute an absolute rule of belief. The Christian faith existed before the Scripture; it was not then the Scripture that founded the faith; and as to the Old Testament, notwithstanding the historical bond which unites it to the New, it possesses much less still of that normative authority.

Hence it is easy to understand how much the theology of Schleiermacher stood at a distance on many points from the orthodox dogma of his time, and at what point stood the doubts which had removed him from the Moravian communion. But those doubts he surmounted by placing his Christianity on bases where it could be marked neither by philosophy nor criticism. Moreover, he voluntarily avoided the excessive neology so much objected to in the rationalists. In the rear of the theologians accused of wishing to demolish everything, he announced the formal intention of re-constructing. His criticism, in reality more advanced than theirs, was at the same time more respectful, and brought to him orthodox persons which the ill-conducted apology of Paulus had not disarmed. In consideration of what he aided to save, his daring acts were pardoned.

But what principally reconciled the moderate party to him, at least the moderate party of the Lutheran clergy, was the importance which he attached to the idea of the Church, so little prominent in the rationalistic dogma, and

even the supernaturalistic dogma of his time. The Church was for him the living organism by which the life of Christ is transmitted through the ages, the focus of Christian life and activity, and, as such, the great and indispensable educator of the human race. He took pleasure in shewing the continuity of this channel in all the periods of Christianity; he loved to throw into relief the merits of the holy men which had glorified the Church in all ages. By this process he brought ecclesiastical history out of the exclusively critical ruts into which the eighteenth century had led it. Neander, in making that history serve as an auxiliary to the Christian revival of our age, only followed the route that Schleiermacher had traced. All this, joined to the eminent gifts which he displayed in preaching, explains to us how, without forming a school properly so called, and despite the numerous adversaries which he met with during his life, he exercised an immense influence on his countrymen. There are few theologians in Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, that have not felt his ascendancy. When the book of Strauss appeared which threw the theological world into disorder and gave the death-blow to the old rationalism as well as the old supernaturalism, the theology of Schleiermacher, which had prepared the fall of both, alone withstood the assaults of the daring demolisher, and became the rallying-point of all the partizans of historical Christianity. From that time dates the great authority which attaches to his name. At a later time, when the old rationalists of Prussia and Saxony, in the assemblies which they organized under the title of "Protestant Friends," or "Friends of Light," allowed themselves to be overrun by the materialism and revolutionary party of "the Annalists of Halle," which paved the way to the convulsions of 1848; when, decried

by that sad alliance, enveloped in the rigours which followed the reaction, they saw their meetings proscribed by even the citizens who had formerly supported them; finally, when the orthodox periodicals, proclaiming the fall of liberal Christianity, urged the civil authority to deal it the final blows, it was the disciples of Schleiermacher which raised it up in public opinion, re-organized its public assemblies, pure henceforth of all compromising alliance, and in gathering at Frankfort (1863), where was inaugurated the Protestanten-Verein (Union of Protestants), called forth an expression of unanimous desires for the formation of a great German Church in which scientific liberty and liberty of the pulpit should be religiously respected. Since the conquests of Prussia in 1866, the influence of the Protestanten-Verein has still more extended. The ecclesiastics displaced or threatened for their progressive opinions have found numerous and devoted friends to procure them justice; energetic resolutions have been taken against the despotism of certain consistories; and the spirit which has presided at the patriotic festivals in honour of John Huss, Luther, Schiller, Alexander Humboldt, Schleiermacher himself, has proved that the sympathies of the middle classes are gained over to Christian liberalism. Schleiermacher, who enlarged, elevated and enfranchised theological science, was not able, notwithstanding the prodigious activity of his mind, to cultivate in the same degree all its branches. Others after him gave themselves to those which he was compelled to neglect. The critical researches relative to the text and the canon of the sacred books, to the origin and primitive history of Christianity, found in his disciple, De Wette, in Chr. Baur, and in "the School of Tübingen," investigators penetrating and ingenious, but adventurous, who perhaps would have made German theo-

logy re-enter into ways too exclusively negative, if by their side theologians renowned for their piety as much as their learning, Rothe and Bunsen among others, while pursuing those useful researches, and insisting on the necessity "of reconciling the enlightened classes with the gospel by the union of Christianity with civilization," had not at the same time preserved to Science the Christian elevation and unction which it had received from Schleiermacher.

§ 3.

Down to our own days, the Protestant populations on this side the Rhine were less prepared to welcome critical labours on sacred Scripture. The formal principle of its normative authority, proclaimed in a manner the most express in the symbols dictated or inspired by Calvin, had also deep roots in the colleges founded under his influence. Perhaps had that of Saumur, early penetrated with the independent spirit of Descartes, pursued or even carried farther than L. Cappel the labours of sacred criticism, &c., forcibly repressed by Louis XIV., as well as its more orthodox sisters of Montauban and Sedan, it would not have seen, like them, its professors dispersed in exile. At least we know that several of them, welcomed at Berlin, rendered themselves suspected there of independent views, and that Frederick William I. shewed himself dissatisfied with the too exclusive moral tendency of their preaching. But, even in France, the violent persecutions suffered by the readers of the Bible had rendered it the object of a species of worship. It was not immediately after the heroic struggles sustained in its name that the authority or the value of one of its books could be advantageously discussed. It was the same in the churches united in spirit with those of France, as well as in those which had undergone the

influence of the Puritans; even those of the Reformed clergy who were accounted most innovating, professed absolute respect for the authority of Scripture. When, in his celebrated panegyric of the Gospels, Rousseau added reserves as to miraculous accounts which they contain, the pastoral body of Geneva, then accused of Socinianism, if not Deism, added its censure to that of the Archbishop of Paris. At the commencement of this century, the Reformers were then nearly unanimous in confessing the divinity of Jesus as miraculously announced and confirmed by the prodigies narrated in the evangelists. The Unitarian churches of England and America did not differ in this respect from the foregoing. Priestley made miracles the basis of his apology; and we see Channing maintain in his works, without superstition, it is true, and without narrowness, the dogma of the inspiration of the sacred books.

However, when the peace of 1815 had made the literary and scientific productions of Germany penetrate into all Western countries, it was not possible to ignore or regret without examination the theological products of the other side of the Rhine. It was known that the great number and the competition of the universities had long kept up there a movement of ideas more active, more free and more prolific, than existed anywhere else. Without being blind to the systematic spirit of the Germans, without adopting indiscriminately their too hasty or too absolute conclusions, we cannot deny how much the history of the Church, that of dogma, the criticism and interpretation of the sacred books, had been enriched by their labours. Students then began to set themselves free from the bonds of theopneustia; they shewed themselves not less respectful, but less timid and circumspect, in researches which had the Bible for their object. To the results of theological science imported

from without, there were soon added in different Protestant countries original researches, the mass of which, increased from day to day, composes what is called "modern" or "liberal" Christian theology, in contrast with the traditional theology. Alsace and Switzerland, more nearly connected with Germany, were the first to receive from it the impulse, and they communicated it to the countries that speak the French language. From the College of Strasburg, among other sources, there came forth critical and exegetical labours of the first order, which, published in French, and in consequence invested with more clearness and precision, naturalized in that country the results of German science. In Switzerland, Zurich became the spot most marked by this movement; but all the Protestant cantons, even those of Roman Switzerland, have more or less felt its influence. In Holland, while the school of Utrecht and that of the Hague are still connected with ancient orthodoxy, and that of Groningen with a progressive Arminianism, the school of Leyden is distinguished by the boldness of its researches; it is to it that we owe the emanicpation of the Dutch Church from the yoke of confessions of belief. What the resemblance of languages has produced in this country, German emigration, more numerous every day, has effected in North America. With the masterpieces of German literature, its theological and philosophical systems have been introduced. Theodore Parker (1810), who had been one of the first to study them, and who in the beginning was alarmed at their boldness, soon entering by his travels into relations with the theologians of our continent, was not long in feeling, like many of them, that a free and sincere examination of the Bible, far from lessening the edification he received from it, made him admire its beauties and appreciate its excellence. It was not, it is true,

without difficulty that he made the American public share his impressions. Nearly all the Unitarian ministers themselves closed their pulpits against him, philanthropic societies refused to receive him as a member; he had to work alone, or with a small number of friends, in the labours of beneficence to which he had consecrated his youth. Liberal Christians of Boston did him more justice. Appointed minister of their congregation, he captivated and ravished them with his enthusiastic words. The intrepid courage which he displayed still more augmented his popularity. He was soon one of the most popular preachers in all America; it was held that so ardent a pastor could not be a despiser of Christ. "It sufficed to hear him to be assured that he had not left the paths of the traditional theology except to draw nearer to God, or humanized the person of Jesus except to make him his model in reality." His premature death (1860) did not cause him to lose any of his influence with his fellow-citizens, and the Universalist school, already so numerous in the United States, considers him as its principal leader. It is in the spirit of that school that the Unitarian Association of Boston in 1870 declared itself opposed to all creeds, and for the union of all Christians around the sole centre of the name of Christ. Finally, in Great Britain they began to feel the necessity of a revival in theology. The abolition of the Corporation and Test Acts for Dissenters, the foundation of the free University of London, in 1854 the abolition of signature to the Thirty-nine Articles at Oxford and Cambridge for non-theologians, prepared the way for considerable independence for theologians themselves. Between the High Church, which inclined more and more to Puseyism, and the Low Church, which by reaction strengthened its Calvinism every day, there was formed among the en-

lightened citizens. The Broad Church, which proclaimed the necessity of a close union between science and faith, and which, since the embassy of Bunsen in England, profited by the knowledge of German theology. From this progressive school there came forth in 1832 the "Bampton Lectures" of Dr. Hampden, then the "Essays and Reviews," with their twelve editions, the "Ecce Homo" of Professor Seeley, and the essays of Colenso, the Bishop of Natal, on the Pentateuch (1860). At the same time (1869), owing to the labours of John James Tayler and his associates, there flourished "the New College, Manchester," in 1853 affiliated to the University of London,* which, with full liberty and scope of religious thought, works freely in the line of Theodore Parker. Thus England has taken rank among the *foci* of progressive Christianity, and already its light begins to pervade England and to penetrate into Scotch Calvinism, notwithstanding the doctrinal law-suits by which the movement is withstood. Although modern criticism has exercised itself more or less on the whole area of Biblical literature, it is on the reality of the extra-natural facts that the debates it has occasioned have more particularly borne; it is thereby that it has caused most emotion in the ancient theological world. It is also on this side that it has been principally regarded by the author of the "Development of Rationalism in Europe," Mr. Lecky. He sees in it the continuation of an anterior movement, which, under the influence of different causes, has become marked and prominent in our time. "In the history of the three last centuries," he says, "there has

* On the removal of this institution to London, the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, established in Manchester in 1854, took up the same liberal work in a more popular form, and in the intervening twenty years has settled above sixty ministers.—*Translator.*

not been a more striking change than that which has manifested itself in the appreciation of miraculous narratives." Among the causes which have accelerated in our age, he mentions the success of the physical sciences in the explanation of phenomena long regarded as supernatural; the modern critical spirit, more severe than ever in the examination of proofs, especially since the knowledge recently acquired of the ancient mythologies and their origin; the movement of modern secularization, involving the decline of ecclesiastical authority; finally, the new conceptions which result from the reform of the natural sciences. "The earth," he says, "is no longer the centre of the world, or man, consequently, the centre of creation. Geological discoveries have crumbled down the whole pre-adamite history of the globe, as well as the old notions as to the origin of death, since the appearance of man on earth was preceded by the death of so many living beings. Scientific discoveries in general have gradually substituted the idea of law for that of an anomalous capricious action which previously was identified with the consciousness of the Divine presence." All this is doubtless true, and in this relation modern science tends to produce in Protestant theology a change analogous to that which the revival of letters produced in the Middle Ages. In our opinion, nevertheless, it would be to form a false and narrow idea of progressive Christianity to restrict it to the negation of the miraculous element, and we find it difficult to understand, on the part of those who deny as well as those who affirm it, all the noise which is made around the question. How can one avoid seeing in the narratives of this kind which Jewish and Christian antiquity has transmitted to us, the necessary product of a time when, the laws of nature being unknown by the bulk and ill-known even by the in-

structed, every extraordinary event, every exceptionally endowed individual, were accounted as surpassing all known bounds, and every elevated and impressive thought as the result of an express revelation from heaven? After the martyrdom of Stephen, Paul is seized with horror at the cruel mission which he is proceeding to Damascus to fulfil, and thinks he hears the voice of Jesus himself stopping and addressing him on his way. Welcomed earnestly by the Pagans on his leaving the synagogues whence the Jews expel him, the call of the Gentiles to salvation, a sublime idea, the natural result of the doctrine of a paternal Deity taught by Jesus, though strange to an old scholar of the Pharisees, strikes his mind like a flash of lightning. The idea seizes, follows, impels, masters him. It is the thought of Christ, and in that thought he sees Christ himself, who says to him, "Speak, and fear not!" Arrived at Troy, he has before him the shores of Europe. There are millions of God's children who claim his ministry. Accordingly a Macedonian during the night cries out to him, "Come over and help us!" Thus each of the heroic resolutions of the apostle bears in his eyes the appearance of a divine oracle. Is it surprising that in cities where his ardent words make themselves heard, transported crowds believe they see prodigies performed by garments which have touched his body, or that reports of a miraculous nature would not spring in after days or distant places from kindled and wondering imaginations? The whole atmosphere was filled with phosphorescent matter which could not find utterance in the narratives. Wonder within became wonder without, and wonder without is merely recorded wonder or miracle. Thus the whole was not only natural, but at the time of day and under the circumstances inevitable. Nor does miracle become a matter of dispute, except

when it is made an argument or an article of faith. Very poor then, I repeat, would be the progress which issued in results so negative. The discernment of the false serves science only as it leads to a clearer or fuller perception of the true. In religion also negation is useful only when it paves the way to faith. Emile Saisset, asked, "Do you believe in the supernatural?" replied, "I believe in Providence." In the same way, if the progressive Christian claims the right to subject all things to the judgment of his conscience and his reason, it is not solely to reject what they cannot receive; it is specially that he may appropriate what in all teaching they recognize as holy or true. Like Paul, he "tries all things, that he may hold fast that which is good." Leaving on one side, as Paul himself did in regard to the Jewish law, what after a scrupulous examination he cannot assimilate, he gathers with the more eagerness every accent of truth which calls forth an echo in his soul, and attaches himself the more strongly to whatever elevates, purifies, regenerates him. In the evangelical history in particular, in the midst of the marvellous features placed there by the spirit of the age, he seizes the thought, everlastingly great, everlastingly holy, which belongs entire to Jesus, which pervades and dominates all his instruction, and which from the Jordan to Golgotha was the soul and the power of his ministry. To bring back sinful man to God by repentance and humility; to unite sinful man to God by love, obedience, sanctity; to unite sinful man to his fellow-men by the bond of fraternal devotedness,—that in the eyes of the progressive Christian is the essence of Christianity, what constitutes its sublimity, what ensures its duration, what, far more than all external proofs, attests its supreme excellence; and it is because he seeks to intimately appro-

priate that thought, because he makes it the focus, the regulator of his religious life, that he proudly entitles himself Christian.

§ 4.

Without extending so far the rights of individual judgment, many theologians acknowledge now that the limits placed in the sixteenth century cannot be maintained in our own except to the injury of the sanctifying effects which faith ought to produce, the first condition of which is sincerity. On seeing earnest souls led to Christianity by the way of examination, and the ineffectiveness of so many efforts made to lead them by another way, so many gigantic resources dispensed in vain for the object, the short duration of so many revivals of which very much had been expected, so many churches where orthodoxy reigned alone deserted by the male population; finally, all the secret troubles, the secret incredulity in a large number of souls supposed to have been converted,—many friends of the ancient theology, whose avowals we possess, have not been able to prevent entertaining the question solemnly discussed in 1857 in the Evangelical Assembly of Berlin, "Whence comes it that the revival of the faith has not led to the revival of Christianity?" and replying, as it has been replied then and since—viz. that the doctrines of the sixteenth century are no longer in complete harmony with the actual state and wants of men's minds. Under the influence of these reflections there has insensibly arisen in the old orthodox schools what is now called the "Third Party," which reckons in the Lutheran and Reformed churches a number of theologians enjoying well-deserved repute.

While admitting the influence of the Divine Spirit in the composition of the Scriptures, this party reserves to

itself the right of treating a crowd of critical questions till now interdicted in the orthodox school. It wishes that in future the common bond in the Christian Church should be, not belief in the infallibility of the Scriptures, nor that of what is called "the Providential Canon," but a living faith in the person of Jesus, and in a supernaturalism which it defines but vaguely. In Germany, this party forms what is called the centre of Schleiermacher's school. Neander, one of its most distinguished chiefs, formerly a contributor to the "Evangelical Gazette" of Berlin, lost no time in protesting against its system of reprobating such as did not come up to its standard of doctrine, a course which is the mortal enemy of the rights of science. In his Biblical historical works he makes no scruple to call in question the literal recital of certain cures and certain miracles, such as those of Pentecost and the conversion of Paul; in the account of the temptation of Jesus he sees a pure symbol. The noise produced by Strauss's Life of Jesus was, according to him, principally due to the efforts made to restore the repute of the mechanical notion of inspiration. In the preface to the "Theological Review," which he undertook with Drs. Nitsch and J. Müller, he declared his agreement with them in the conviction that "no progress could take place in understanding the truths confided to the Church without a formal distinction between the word of God and the sacred Scripture, a new determination of the relations between the Old Testament and the New, full liberty of research on the point of the Bibilical canon," &c. A great number of German theologians have followed in this path, and Dr. Tholuck declared more than twenty years ago that you would not find in Germany two theologians that held the absolute inspiration of the Bible. "To-day," says Professor Dorner, "the old juridical theory of satis-

faction is rejected. . . . . There is a general tendency toward admitting a continual development of the soul in the eternal life, and the possibility of conversion in another economy." A similar movement has taken place in the Reformed churches of the French language. This owes its origin to Samuel Vincent and Alexander Vinet.

Samuel Vincent, in the beginning of his pastorate at Nimes, remained imbued with the intellectualist theology of his time (1809). With him, as with Chalmers, whose "Evidences of Christianity" he had translated, revelation was "a course of teaching bearing upon truths which, without it, would have been beyond the reach of the human mind. The divinity of that revelation, demonstrated by the external proofs drawn principally from the Biblical miracles and prophecies, stamped all the contents of the New Testament with one and the same quality of authority, in such a way that, without denying revelation, the Protestant could not lower any of it." At a later time, without combating those miraculous statements which he found mixed with the tissue of the evangelical history, he did not hesitate to acknowledge the insufficiency of the proof commonly drawn from it. Kant, Schleiermacher, De Wette, whom he studied, taught him to give his Christian convictions a more solid basis. From that time, says his friend Ferd. Fontanés, there is in his publications more depth and a more decided tendency to put Christianity into relations with the facts of conscience and the wants of our soul. Without ceasing to employ reflection and science in historical religion and theology, he penetrates further into human nature, passes from ideas to the sentiment which has produced them, and draws from the heart a faith throbbing with life and fecundity. Such is the second phase of his theological career. The intimate agreement of

Christianity with conscience, its power to call forth in man the divine principle, to transform the moral being in him—such is the principal title which he invokes in Vincent's favour. Samuel Christian was thus one of the first to remove Reformed French theology out of the ruts in which it was engaged, and to proclaim a pure Christian spiritualism. He did not live long enough to follow out the prolific applications of it to the end. But this question which he put to himself in the preface of a work composed a little before his death, "What is there transient, what permanent in Christianity?" and this maxim, by which he seems to have intended to reply to the question, "Every dogma which does not awaken an echo in the soul, and produce a reverberation in it, is not necessary to salvation," shew to what an extent his views had been enlarged. Alexander Vinet was not slow in following him, and in getting beyond him on the same road.

Born at Lausanne (1797), and professor of French literature at Bâle (1847), while De Wette was in exile in that city, he there, probably by means of the latter, underwent the influence of Schleiermacher. His religious beliefs were not yet fixed when he heard of the attacks which, in his birthplace, had been made on the rights of the orthodox dissidents, the dispersion of peaceable meetings by popular violence and by a government which made itself the blind instrument of the misdeeds (1824). Occupied at this time with the grave question of religious liberty, he undertook the defence of the oppressed, and in espousing their cause espoused their doctrines, which had many zealous friends in Bâle.

However, in uttering them from the pulpit he did not fail to make some of the observations of which we spoke but now, and which were made at the same time in En-

gland by the celebrated preacher, F. Robertson. In his efforts to bring to the gospel cultivated persons, he found that a style of preaching which was fully successful with converted auditors, was not always the most fit to convert; that to insult reason was not the means to reduce it to silence; that to deny human liberty, to lower sentiment and works to the advantage of faith, to declare yourself saved on the ground that you were certain of being so, was to run on the rock of antinomianism, and in any case to astound those who found in the gospel very different teachings. The process that was silently going on in his mind (1837) made its appearance in his installation in the chair of Practical Theology at Lausanne. He boldly combated some of the defects of the preaching of the revival, and in the degree in which he more closely saw those whose cause he had pleaded, his ideas insensibly took a new turn. In truth, in 1839, when the great Vaudois Council abolished the compulsory signature of the Helvetic Confession, he spoke against the intrusion of the civil authority in matters of faith. But eight years later, when after the dismissal of the pastors the new free Church had to be organized, the dogmatic symbol which he proposed for it was so moderate and liberal as to scandalize some members of the Synod, so little place was held in it by what were called the fundamental dogmas of the revival; and thenceforward he did not cease to insist on the too small part assigned to sanctification in the work of salvation. "Faith saves only because it regenerates; sanctity is paradise, vice is hell," he said, with Origen. Like Schleiermacher, he acknowledged more continually the insufficiency of the ancient mode of defending Christianity founded on external proofs; the impossibility for a man to become a Christian so long as his conscience and his heart were not won over by the

excellence of Christianity. "The miracles," he said, "do not convert; the same may be said of the prophecies. The divinity of the gospel is proved by its power, that is, by its quickening concurrence with the most elevated aspirations and needs of man. Christ is the centre of the gospel; to be a Christian is to belong to Christ." "The great merit of the Reformation," he also said, "was the restoration to the individual of all his responsibility; to remove him from the convenient government of the faith of authority, and to impose upon him the most severe of laws, that of liberty. The characteristic principle of Protestantism lies on the outside of dogma; it is the absolute independence of conscience." This subjectivism, this individualism of Vinet's theology, would have conducted him very far without the influence of his surroundings and his orthodox connections. It was, in some sort, to authorize each person to strip religion of all the elements which his conscience repels, to regard as an alien element whatever is not in friendly relations with his inmost sentiment; in a word, it was to make a good part of the journey which modern theology had to make. If Vinet did not discern the whole bearing of his principles, some of his disciples had a more distinct view of them. One of them, who joined to the subjective tendency acquired in Vinet's lessons a theological culture superior to his own, invited to be a professor in a school subject to theopneustic doctrines of Scotland, raised his voice against a theology built on such a basis, and a rupture ensued (1850), which gave birth to "La Revue de Strasburg" ("The Strasburg Review"), the first manifesto of modern theology in France. Other disciples of Vinet, less consequent or more docile, propagated his principles not only in Switzerland but in France, where already his influence had made itself felt by the

preaching of Verny, by the publication of "Le Semeur" ("The Sower"); finally, by the Vaudois pastors, who, after their retirement, were called to direct churches and schools. There was then formed in the Reformed communion a "Third Party," similar to that which we have seen arise in the Lutheran communion. More familiar than Vinet with the processes of Biblical criticism and the results of the history of dogma, this party separated more and more from that of infallibility, that of "the Providential Canon," from the ancient apology founded on external proofs, from the doctrine of original sin in the absolute sense of Augustine, from the juridical theory of "equivalent satisfaction" according to Calvin, from the doctrine of the Trinity formulated by the ancient councils. He does not acknowledge in Jesus "the God-man," except under reserve of his subordination to the person of the Father; he hesitates on the personality of the Holy Spirit; and finally admits the Christian supernaturalism, except so far as the origin of Christianity appears to him inexplicable in the order of natural facts, whatever idea may be formed of particular miracles.

Accused by the old orthodoxy, and sometimes very severely, of tending by its philosophic method to overturn Christianity, it accuses that orthodoxy in its turn of giving it up to the contempt of cultivated men, and of conducing by its narrow despotism to perpetuate rationalism. In vain does it grow angry with the new theology; it finds itself drawn away by the current. Not being able to obtain a complete return to the old doctrines, it is obliged, under pain of insulation, to enter on the way of compromise, and to be content with what the Third Party is good enough to grant it. Provided Unitarianism is sacrificed to it, as well as the liberal theology, it ends, as has been seen on

many an occasion, by adopting professions of faith the least explicit on dogmas which it had before pronounced the most important.

Nothing better describes the actual disorder of the old dogmatic parties than the impossibility in which they are of re-establishing the old confessions of faith, their embarrassment when the question comes up of promulgating new ones, the number of attempts that have been made and failed, the unexpected breadth of the new formulas adopted by the free or national churches, which on this point have shewn themselves the most exacting. The difficulty has been greater still when the aim has been to unite under the same dogmatic flag the orthodox members of different countries, as was proposed in the foundation of "the Evangelical Alliance."

The spirit of exclusion to which the first promoters of the religious revival surrendered themselves, had ended in a breaking up that became disquieting and troublesome for themselves when they saw Protestantism crumble into a crowd of dissident churches and chapels, each having their very narrow symbol; they feared they had compromised it in public opinion and weakened it in face of its formidable adversary. They found themselves constrained on the narrow area within which they had confined themselves, and which did not enlarge as they at first expected. Thus reduced to make themselves understood only before assemblies not numerous and always the same, they wished to occupy wider areas. They said to each other that the recognition of different ecclesiastical authorities did not involve the exemption of common points on which they might understand one another, was it solely for the exclusion of common opponents. The project conceived first in Scotland, shortly after the new Scotch secession, definitively

arranged in an assembly in London, soon found favour among the orthodox of the old and new continent. But to bring together these assemblies reputed œcumenical, a considerable number of disciples, both dissident and national, required numerous mutual concessions, as well as the mitigation or even the annulling of points of doctrine regarded as fundamental. The symbol of nine articles drawn up in England, latitudinarian as it appeared in Scotland, seemed narrow to the orthodox of the continent. It became necessary to reduce it to five articles, then to three, then to one alone, on which they have not been very strict.

Such, then, at present is the position of a theological party which at the beginning of the century was proud of its immobility, and pretended to impose it on the entire Church. Urged forward by the Third Party, which itself underwent the influence of a more advanced party, it abandoned its old entrenchments one after another, lowered its standard opportunely, sacrificed characteristic dogmas, or, if it retains the words, lessens the sense every day.

Thus was gradually accomplished in the bosom of Protestantism that new reformation called for in these days by the progress of general intelligence. The new ideas suggested to some by views more exact, deeper spiritual wants, at first astonished many. But united to sentiments, the genuineness of which could not be doubted, they became acceptable to other minds, which, perhaps in moderating them, facilitated their way among the crowd. What was at first accounted heresy was soon a simple boldness, with which the most timorous finally familiarized themselves. By degrees truth comes into light, passes one after the other the barriers set in its way, spreads from neighbour to neighbour by the slow but sure way which God has traced for it; and religion, which had been thought threatened at

every step, only confirmed itself the more at every step. Then, in the degree in which the stationary party shewed itself less decisive in its affirmations, less provoking in its censures, the progressive party in its turn is able, without betraying the interests of truth, to moderate an opposition which was become less necessary, quit the field of controversy at the right moment; finally, follow the precept and the example of Paul, who, while defending Christian liberty against tyrannical requirements, avoided making a stone of stumbling for his brethren, condescended to the infirmities of the weak, and recommended to all to seek peace and mutual edification by the union of charity with truth.

§ 5.

However high the walls with which a Church may surround itself, it cannot for ever guard against the law of progress. We have seen that law penetrate into the Protestant nations which were most opposed to its influence. It was also to emerge in more than one Catholic nation, and first in those which, by their habitual contact with Protestant populations, opened to it freer access. Here then it is again on the side of Germany that our eyes must first turn. It has in our time manifested itself there in two directions. One of the two, somewhat similar to the tendencies of the pietistic revival, proceeded specially from the school previously founded (1796) in Bavaria by Michael Sailer. Baader, Ellendorf, Martin Boos and others, disciples of that theologian, nurtured, like him, in the works of the ancient mystics, and almost all of them in relations with the modern pietists, made the essential element of religion to consist, not in external union with the Church, but in direct union with Christ, independent, according to them, of every external observance. Treating as vain

parade the pomps of Catholicism, they spread among the students contempt for indulgences, as well as the worship of saints and images. Thus they brought on themselves from the clergy violent persecutions, which obliged some to flee in a mass into Protestant lands (1817-24), while others gave themselves up to outbreaks of fanaticism too frequent among persecuted parties. In the convents of the Tyrol, some of their adepts, embracing the reveries of Rose of Lima, seriously believed they had received the stigmata of the crucified Jesus. The parishioners of Poeschl, parish priest of Lintz, who after his retirement would recognize no other pastor, immolated on Good Friday (1817) in one of their conventicles a maiden who of her own accord resolved to die to expiate the sins of the community. These sad aberrations opened the eyes of the heads of the party, which afterwards restricted their mysticism within wiser limits, and sought, according to the example of Fenelon and François de Sales, nothing more than to mix with Catholicism a salutary leaven of spirituality. It is in this direction, little liked in Rome, that, among others, the Abbé Bautain laboured, who was afterwards Bishop of Strasburg. The other progressive tendency in the bosom of Catholicism proceeded rather from the regions of science. From the end of the last century, and till toward the year 1835, a great number of Catholic ecclesiastics, brought up in the mixed universities of Germany, and living familiarly with the Protestants, had renounced many ancient prejudices and approached Protestant doctrines. The Catholic universities themselves, founded in different cities of the West and the South, stimulated by the vicinity of Protestant universities, had favoured the cultivation of the theological sciences in their own bosom; thence proceeded scholars who in many respects might take rank with the

representatives of Protestant science. Such were Jahn, Hug, Scholz, in Biblical Criticism and Introduction; Locherer, in the history of the Church, &c. Some did not even fear, in the exposition of dogmas, to profit by the philosophical systems of Kant and Schelling, and the labours of Schleiermacher. Froschammer, professor at Munich, published (1858-61) his Introduction to Philosophy and his book on the Liberty of Science. Reyberger declared that he did not recognize the tradition of the Church as authentic and true, except so far as it accorded with scripture, human nature and sound reason. Others, classing among "divine" verities the dogma of the Real Presence, acknowledged in that of Transubstantiation only an "ecclesiastical" dogma. Hermes, professor of Bonn (died 1834) declared that the Roman faith, founded on authority, could not raise the mind above doubt, and attempted to give a more solid basis to the Catholic doctrine by conciliating it with reason.

But it is in worship and discipline that reforms were specially urgent, and it is also for these purposes that the principal friends of progress directed their efforts. Wessenberg, Bishop of Constance, not satisfied with introducing into the divine service, as much as was possible, the use of the vulgar tongue, combated the absolute infallibility of the Pope, the obligation of celibacy for the priests; established among the ecclesiastics of his diocese theological conferences, the result of which he published in the periodical archives. Anthony Theiner of Breslau, in his work on "The Church of Silesia" (1826), unsparingly exposed some of the most prominent abuses of Catholic doctrine, worship and government; and by his polemics on the subject of obligatory celibacy, called forth (1824-32) against that abuse petitions from numerous ecclesiastics

of the south of Germany, and even of the diocese of Trèves. The Papacy, it is true, strong in the spirit of political reaction which expressed itself in all the courts, triumphed for the most part over these oppositions. It took from Wessenberg (1833) the administration of the diocese of Constance, peremptorily rejected the greater part of the articles which were proposed to it for the Concordat (1832), paralyzed by a solemn declaration the movement in favour of the marriage of the priests, educated ecclesiastics in seminaries separated from the universities (1835), put the faculties of theology in Germany under absolute dependence on the Jesuits; then, not satisfied with concessions obtained from Frederick William IV., prohibited by the Archbishop of Cologne the teaching of the doctrines of Hermes, and compelled his principal disciples to make a retractation (1844). In Switzerland, finally, where many Lucerne ecclesiastics had declared for the "Conference of Baden," by its intrigues it frustrated that liberal movement, and overset the government of Lucerne which had supported it (1836). But when, emboldened by these successes, the Ultramontane party thought it could revive the ancient superstitions, when the Bishop of Trèves invited (1844) the populations to come and worship in his church the celebrated "coat without seam," more than a million pilgrims, it is true, went to put its miraculous virtue to the test; the protest of two young ecclesiastics, Ronge and Czerski, sufficed to call forth in the enlightened citizens a movement quite similar to that which the excesses of the religious reaction had just called forth among the Protestants. In the principal cities numerous assemblies were organized of "German Catholics," separated from Rome, who were not slow in allying themselves with the Protestant "Friends of Light." The two parties worked

in common for the defence of their liberty, and would, perhaps, have achieved its recognition, if, at the approach of the political agitation which was in preparation, invaded the one and the other, overflowed, compromised by the revolutionists and the new Hegelians, they had not lost their popularity with the citizen class and seen their assemblies early dissolved. The joy of their adversaries was, nevertheless, of short duration. The liberal Catholic opposition, always active, though latent and compressed on the outside, but henceforth sheltered against all suspicion of connivance with the revolution, waited only for a new opportunity for manifesting itself. In 1861, A. De Toqueville recommended to the French clergy the example of the Catholic professors of Bonn, who saw in the religious liberty, and in the concurrence of the religious parties, an auxiliary of the old revival of which the Church had need. The Encyclic of 1864 and the Council of 1870 soon gave birth to the expected opportunity. If the German bishops, at first undecided and rather opposed, as they had shewed themselves in the first assembly of Fulda, dared not at the last moment separate their cause from that of the Holy See; if indeed some of them, as the Archbishop of Mayence, took pains, by an increase of Ultramontane violence, to atone for their preceding hesitations, it was not thus with the professors and pupils of the universities. In the faculties of theology themselves, though thoroughly given up for the most part to the influence of the Jesuits, some distinguished doctors, after having combated the preparations, the procedure, and finally the decree of the Vatican Council, with the arms of the gospel and of historical science, being excommunicated for their persistent opposition, saw group around them a noble body of ecclesiastics and laymen who openly declared that they withdrew from the

authority of the Court of Rome, and wished to form themselves into a "German Catholic Church." At this decisive moment we see in Catholicism, as we have before seen in Protestantism, a sunderance between the Church and Science declare itself. To the absolutist maxims of the Middle Ages those doctors opposed the principles that were in vigour in the first ages of the Church, and in their quality of "Old Catholics" (this is the name by which they designated themselves) shewed themselves decided to repel the novelties which Rome, in a pretended Œcumenical Council, had caused to be ratified. The movement has not ceased to extend since; it counts, it is said, in Germany more than two hundred thousand adherents. In several cities the municipalities have put churches at their disposal. Several governments, those of Prussia and Baden, recognized the justice of their cause. Threatened themselves by the political maxims of the Syllabus, and by the spirit of separation and even sedition which they developed in the people and the clergy of certain provinces, they undertook the defence of the deprived priests and excommunicated professors, and put the servants of Rome out of condition to injure them. We have seen that in the principal cantons of Switzerland the opposition was not less active or less supported. The chiefs of this opposition, moreover, in breaking with Rome, declare that they remain faithful to the Catholic Church, of which they say that the Pope is not the head but the tyrant. "Neither slaves nor rebels," such is their maxim. One of their first measures in Germany was the nomination of a bishop, whom they had consecrated by the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht, and who was recognized by the Prussian and Baden governments. But under the episcopate they established parish councils and synods nominated by the flock. Then, once

the chain which held them bound to the Middle Ages being broken, they progressively approach evangelical simplicity and spirituality. Among them, ecclesiastical celibacy, monastic vows, compulsory confession, are already not in principle solely, but in fact, abolished. Divine service is celebrated in the national languages; the ideas of transubstantiation, real and expiatory sacrifice, are excluded from the Mass. Who can say where this advance will stop? The scholars assembled at Munich in June, 1871, announced themselves willing to found a free Church, organized in agreement with the civilization of Germany. In many respects they surpass the limits indicated by their name of "Old Catholics," and would justify rather that of "Liberal Catholics," if the former did not better suit their present situation. Thus, on the part of Protestantism, no impatience, no indiscreet proselytism! Let us leave to this secession from the Catholic Church the care to constitute and consolidate itself. Spontaneousness is an indispensable condition of success and duration for a party which, better than ours, is qualified to evangelize those in different multitudes whom Rome held under its sway without ever knowing how to lead them to Jesus. If there is a country where the last decree of the Vatican seemed likely to encounter an energetic resistance, it was that which now for a long time had given its name to the anti-Roman opposition; that where Gallicanism* had thrown out so much splendour, and struck roots held to be so deep; that

* Gallicanism, or what is now called *Liberal Catholicism* in contrast with Ultramontanism, the preponderant power in the Papal Church since the Vatican Council, took a definite shape from the pen of the celebrated Bossuet in these terms (1682): "1st. That the Pope has received power from God only over spiritual things, and not over temporal and civil things. 2nd. That even in spiritual matters the authority

of Bossuet, Mabillon, Pithou; that where the articles of 1682, which unbound the prince and enchained the clergy, had been drawn up by the clergy themselves; where, to recal only more modern times, liberal Catholicism under the restoration, and later under the Orleans dynasty, had had on its side the first of the writers and publicists; where one of them maintained at Malines, in a congress of bishops, the necessity of closely in future uniting Catholicism with liberty; where his friend, a not less zealous Catholic, declared (1852) that "the Church, to recover its ascendancy in the present day, ought to appropriate all the true lights shed abroad in the world; that the Catholic philosophy, instead of being demonstrative, as in the Middle Ages, ought to be inquisitive, and go back to faith along the path of examination;" where an Archbishop of Paris publicly lauded the preacher who, in the pulpit of Notre Dame, had just affirmed "the solidity of the bases which reason furnishes to morality," and represented as "the essential mission of the Church to prepare the faithful for entering into direct communion with God;" where, finally, prelates and monks seemed for a moment united to deplore the convocation of the Council of Rome, and to combat the decree which would be published there.

And yet, excepting the eminent preacher whom we cited but now, and who previously, denounced by the Jesuits, rather than betray his conscience, had preferred quitting the pulpit which he made illustrious, not one of those prelates, not one of those monks, refused his signature to the Vatican decree; the bishops of Paris, Orleans,

of the Pope is not unlimited, unless the assent of the Church intervenes. 3rd. That the rules, customs and institutions received in the kingdom and in the Gallican Church ought to retain their virtue and their force, and the usages of our fathers remain unshaken."—*Trans.*

Sura, gave up the proud attitude which they had held during the Council; Father Gratry erased with one stroke of his pen the most solid objections consigned in his books; the *Oratoire* and the *Sorbonne* bowed their neck to the same yoke. The sentiments of Lacordaire against Papal infallibility were known only after his death; and as to Montalembert, who revealed them, it is only on his death-bed that he himself abjured his worship for "the idol that is incensed in the Vatican." It is all over; the ancient Gallicanism has extinguished itself. Perhaps among the high French clergy it was never anything but a doctrine of circumstances. Who does not remember in what interest it drew up its declaration of 1682, with what eagerness it afterwards excused itself with the Holy See, and what urgency it employed with Louis XIV. to suspend its effect? Under an absolute prince, who before all things meant to be master in his own house, that clergy, to obtain the ruin of dangerous rivals, Protestants and Jansenists, had taken a position against the Pope by the side of the Monarch; the reward it expected once obtained, it turned toward the Pontiff with redoubled deference and submission.

With greater reason in our own days this return to Ultramontanism may be understood, and to a certain point excused. After so many proofs that the civil power in France has given of its instability, after the horrible excesses to which the revolutionary anarchy has been carried against the clergy, one understands that, not finding any sure support around it, the ecclesiastics seek it in the Vatican and under the protecting wing of the Jesuits. Under such conditions they give themselves up to them entirely. No more light, no more science that may be of disservice to them; even no more simple good done to control their miracles and their new forms of worship; every bishop owes incense

to the Sacred Heart,* and his faith to the word of the infallible Pontiff.

As to the inferior clergy, proceeding for the most part from the lowest classes of the population, educated by the Jesuits in their seminaries, cut off from all commerce with Protestants, placed by the Concordat under the entire control of the bishops, it marches under their orders, as said a certain archbishop, "with the docility of a regiment." It is only in the times of revolution that it dared shew any relic of resistance, and speak of making the Church of France independent of Rome. But for that it was not sufficient, as appeared in Lyons, where an attempt was made (1864) to oppose to the Roman liturgy a pretended liturgy of Saint Irenæus, although it did something to decorate with the title of "Church of France" a microscopic chapel opened in Paris, to entitle it the Primate, to celebrate in it mass in French, and to associate in the sermon a panygeric of Napoleon with one of Jesus Christ.

Among the laymen themselves, liberal Catholicism counts but a small number of earnest adherents. For a long time it has not found in France to support and stimulate it anything similar to what supports and stimulates it in Germany. The Jesuitical breath freezes every intellectual aspiration, every religious individualism, and leaves to independent minds no other refuge than indifference. Jansenism, if it still subsists, lives retired in an old quarter of Paris. The nobility, in its dream of legitimacy, closely binds its cause to that of the Bishop of Rome. The opulent class, in the alarm called forth in it by revolutions, requires

* See in the *Anti-papal Library*, No. I., Mary Alacoque and the worship of the Sacred Heart of Jesus presented in their real character, from the French of Louis Asseline, by John R. Beard. 4*d*. London: Smart and Allen.

of religion, not an enlightened people, but a deferential one. The people itself, brought up in ignorance by a clergy which has a monopoly of education, dares not, even after it has ceased to believe in the priest, repel his ministry or resist his influence; they resist only in days of trouble, and then by acts of violence which tend to call forth a reaction. Finally, in a state composed of elements so diverse and yet so centralized as France, no government would venture to authorize the measures which otherwheres are accomplished without difficulty. No place, then, today in the Church of France for any one who, wishing to remain Catholic, claims liberty of thought. On the outside of Ultramontanism and philosophy there is only irreligion, or at least scepticism. "Liberal Christianity," says M. Vacherot, "will make numerous conquests in the Protestant world. . . As to Catholic societies, their repugnance to it is invincible. . . In France particularly, it would be more easy to pass of a sudden from religion to philosophy, than to stop at any form of Christianity whatever." This is what Lamennais did after his rupture with Rome. At one bound he leapt over Catholicism and Protestantism, which last he treated as "a bastard system," and published his "Esquisse d'une Philosophie" ("Sketch of Philosophy"). Before him Jouffroy spoke of Christianity as the last religion, and philosophy as alone destined to survive it. It is then on the philosophic party alone that we can now definitely reckon for the emancipation of Catholic France. Consequently it is worth our trouble to closely examine in what direction philosophy now inclines, on what terms it finds itself with Christianity, and whether its actual evolutions tend to put them at a distance or to bring them near to each other.

§ 6.

For a moment, we have said, there was a fear that we might see the modern discoveries of science in the provinces of nature and history put philosophy again in hostility with religion. That fear seemed so much the more founded, that at the same time persons who called themselves Christian philosophers, in order to raise the value of revelation, as they thought, re-enthroned philosophical scepticism, attempted to weaken the natural proofs of Providence and immortality, and, as if they had never heard speak of Socrates and Plato, repeated in an oracular tone—"Christian or Atheist!" "Catholic or Pantheist!" This was done to gratify certain believers, but in reality it gave countenance to unbelief. More recently, in France as well as in Germany, philosophers, truly worthy of that name, placing themselves, in order to defend Theism, on the same ground of the natural sciences where others had taken their stand in order to attack it, demonstrated at least the uncertainty of the facts alleged by atheistic naturalists. They boldly deny spontaneous generation; they have more than doubts on the indefinite transformation of species, which, moreover, would not exclude a first creation; and as to the facts the reality of which is less contestable, they victoriously combat the conclusions deduced from them. In vain do they interrogate and scrutinize matter; they declare they do not find in it any sign of that spontaneous moving force, much less of that intelligence, which is attributed to it. Does the organism give an account of the phenomena of life and mind, they ask, who will give an account of that organism itself? Who made the brain capable of scrutinizing thought; who has provided it with that nervous electricity, capable of feeling, observing, judging, willing, communicating the

effect of its will; how can a purely material being, whose integral materials are ceaselessly renewed, in the midst of that perpetual circulation, preserve, during so many years, the sentiment of its personal identity? How, especially, can materialism explain in man those determinations of the moral being which, for a superior interest, make it resist the material instincts, even so far as to brave the destruction of the organism? Finally, in the regular concatenation of the phenomena of nature and history, instead of a mechanical succession blindly advancing of its own accord, without beginning and without end, everything leads to the recognition of the evident action of laws which a wise and supreme Regulator has put in action, the result of properties with which He has endued His inanimate creatures, and inclinations with which He has gifted free beings in order to lead them to His own ends. It is thus that modern philosophy, after having, in its uneasy research after unity, oscillated for some time between idealist and materialist Pantheism, returns in the footsteps of scientists of the highest authority, to a spiritualistic Theism much more living than that of the Deists of the last century, since it admits the constant action of God in His works; much more solid also than the ancient Theism, since, less exclusively founded on metaphysical principles, it gives a better account of the results of observation, and has undergone the test of the new discoveries of science.

But what sincere Theist, said Barclay, can be the enemy of Christianity? Let us say rather, what Theist truly philosophic, who, with the light of history, does not confess that if the knowledge of the true God, instead of remaining, as with the ancient sages, the exclusive property of some prophets and some thinkers, has in the space of only eighteen centuries become the heritage of the entire

world, and now is spreading to the ends of the earth; if the God who was of old unknown now presents Himself to the adoration of the lowliest minds under features at once sublime and touching; if the worship in spirit and in truth which is His due has already triumphed over so many barbarous superstitions; if moral civilization has made in the world progress so far surpassing that of ancient days,—it is to Jesus, to his incomparable teaching, to his saintly life, to his ministry devoted even to death; finally, to his glorious martyrdom, so prolific of the purest and highest effects—where, I ask, is the philosopher who, in presence of this grand fact, does not recognize in the gospel, despite some inferior elements easy to be eliminated, the most inestimable of spiritual treasures conferred on the world, without blessing God for the share which he has himself received, and returning with the aid of study and reflection, perhaps through many doubts, to the principles with which his childhood was imbued, traces of which he finds in his heart's core—does not appreciate so much the more the benefits of Christian education, which spares to the multitude of human beings those long and anxious wanderings? "Society," says Emile Saisset, "needs a spiritual ministry, which has the character of universality, which embraces all the members that compose it, the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant. . . But philosophy is incapable in itself to undertake this spiritual ministry in modern society." "In vain will you interrogate the entire history of the human race," says M. Barthelemy Saint Hilaire; "you will find nothing equal to the religious edifice raised by Christianity, and which forms its present state, the guarantee of a future, the end of which no one can assign." Nevertheless, let us make no mistake, in acknowledging in Christianity, for

the progress of religious truth in the world, a vehicle which cannot be replaced; philosophy does not intend to abdicate its rights, or to allow its special services to be disowned. "Philosophy," says Saisset, in the same article that we have just cited, "has acquired in the two last centuries not only the right to exercise itself with independence, but the right to comprehend in its domain, as vast as reason and humanity, all the wants, all the developments of human nature. To abdicate that right would be a weakness." . . "Philosophers," adds M. Paul Janet, "in all ages combated by the theologians in the name of faith, ask for nothing better than alliance with the theologians, with those at least who do not systematically attack reason and liberty, as well as with the scientific men attached to pure spiritualism." How in effect can we do else than recognize that right in our turn? The religious sentiment, left to itself, without counterpoise and without control, is subject to strange, at times baneful deviations. Divers religious parties furnish more than one example. The philosophy of the last century had caused them partially to disappear; they have re-appeared with the religious revival of our age; and will re-appear, so long as piety shall not have for monitor and guide within, or for superintendent and corrector without, an enlightened and severe philosophy. It is necessary from time to time for reason to hold its torch over the manifestations of which religion is the source, under the penalty of its destroying itself by its own eccentricities, or the extravagances of those who speak in its name. It is from the school of Voltaire that France, led astray by its priests, had to learn religious toleration. It is the influence of Franklin and Jefferson that has neutralized in America, as that of W. Robertson in Scotland, the rugged fanaticism of the Puritans. It was a Cardinal friend

of the philosophers, Lambertini, who raised his voice against the ignoble devotion of the Sacred Heart. Such, in regard to the Church, is the part of philosophy; a part favourable or hostile according as it is welcomed or repelled by it, but which is never better fulfilled than by the medium of a purified and progressive Christianity. Insulate your house, some day it will be smitten by the lightning; withdraw the threatening fluid from the cloud, it will be safe from its blow. You wish to preserve the Church from impious and anarchical doctrines; let it be pervaded by true lights of all kinds. This, as has been shewn by judges as competent as impartial, Remusat, Montegut, Saint-René, was the cause of the success of Unitarianism in its struggle against the subversive tendencies of the last century. It is in giving legitimate satisfaction to the philosophic spirit, that, "in the midst of an unbelieving generation, it maintains in England, in Switzerland, in America, a public sincerely Christian." The progressive Christianity of our days, in still recognizing the rights of philosophy, will render to the Church a service not less essential.

Let us go further, and considering philosophy not only as a just and legitimate employment of the human faculties, but under its own point of view the most elevated, as the top-stone, the crown of the sciences, whose results it gathers together, co-ordinates and generalizes, let us ask if the progress of those sciences during three centuries has impoverished or aggrandized the ideas which Christianity gives us of the Divine attributes; if the invisible perfections of God which Paul contemplated in his works must have shone with less brilliancy in the eyes of a Kepler and of a Newton; if, consequently, a still deeper acquaintance with the world and its marvels, of the harmony which

unites all its parts one with another, will not more vividly excite our sentiments of adoration for its Author; if the attentive study of nature and of history in shewing us everywhere in the Divine economy the good emerging out of evil, liberty correcting its own excesses, the general order constantly maintained, then even when it seems most disturbed, the infinite variety of means which the Sovereign Disposer employs to conduct His intelligent creatures to good;—if all this, I say, even in the midst of the obscurities which still envelope us, will not enlighten for us with a new light the problem of our destiny, and, by replacing in us by a courageous optimism the dark and enervating dualism of former times, will not imprint more deeply still on the religious thought that stamp of pious submission and serene confidence, entire devotement to the Divine will, which characterizes the prayer of the true Christian? If, then, philosophy itself is discredited in breaking with religion, you will not better serve the interests of religion by in its name denying the rights of philosophy, by putting faith in hostility with science. "The men of science," said Prince Albert, "are not, as the ignorant have sometimes said, presumptuous unbelievers, Titans bent on scaling the skies." In the first rank of the scientific ladder you now see men who, without seeking the patronage of any religious party, uphold all the causes dear to humanity, all the principles of which Christian wisdom is proud. Will the Church be so blind as to disdain their co-operation?

Philosophy and Religion, "those two immortal sisters," are now more than ever necessary one to another—"philosophy to throw light on religion, religion to sanctify philosophy." Separated, enemies so far as they will not treat except on the footing of a mutual servitude, they

ought henceforward to unite by the bond of mutual services, appropriating each willingly the truths which the other has established, and work in concert, each by its own method, to enrich humanity. Now this, we repeat, is the happy evolution which seems in our day to bring them near each other, and which permits us to discern a better future for France, despite the slowness of the progress and the momentary checks of liberal Catholicism. Theism, that Theism which is at once philosophic and Christian, which calls upon us to draw water from every pure well, to go to God by all the ways which He has opened before us, to put at His service all the gifts which we have received at His hand,—such is the banner under which, in the future, the friends whom religious truth reckons in all camps will unite and fraternize one with another.

§ 7.

The considerations into which we have just entered apply principally to the Western churches. They, indeed, are at the head of the modern progress of religious science. During long time the Greek Church, the Russian Church herself, had not been able to partake therein. The regular clergy who filled its numerous convents, supported by the female nobility and the people in the rural districts, was systematically hostile to all novelty in the Church as in the State. The popes or simple priests, coming for the most part from poor families, compulsorily married before entering into orders, succeeding each other not less compulsorily from father to son, constrained for the subsistence of their families to consecrate themselves to the labours of the field, the majority without any veritable occupation for their ministry, and having learnt in the schools hardly more than to read the liturgy mechanically, vegetated, they and

their parishes, in a spiritual state the most deplorable. However, in the degree in which civilization penetrates into the heart of Russia, the character and the instruction of the clergy receives a happy impulse. As early as the end of the last century and the beginning of this, Plato, Metropolitan of Moscow, a learned historian and eloquent preacher, was the founder of a seminary and the head of a theological school, which presided over the revival of zeal and the progress of science. Philaretes, his disciple, conversant with the Protestant literature of Germany, directed a society of friends of religious instruction, which had for its object to raise the Russian people out of its spiritual abasement. Other associations of a like kind were later on founded by Gregory, Metropolitan of Petersburg, by Bishop Macarios, and by some other members of the high clergy. From the year 1855, religious journals began to be multiplied, as well as versions of the Bible, in its different languages and dialects. The religious press in general became more active. Alexander II. seconded those efforts by the foundation of new seminaries, animated by quite a different tendency than that of Kief, and where the influence of Protestant principles and the German philosophy and theology began to penetrate. Moreover, Alexander II. rendered eminent services to the Church by binding the ecclesiastics to serious studies, in allowing sons of the priests to enter into orders only so far as they felt a real vocation to the ministry, and in making that ministry accessible to all those who judged themselves fit for its exercise, so that the Russian Church already counts in its ranks young priests well informed and of exemplary morals. After a reform of so salutary a nature, there is everything to be hoped for from clergy who, as M. Boissard observes, "connected with their country by family

and social ties, far from insulating themselves from the nation, and from raising their influence above that of the State which protects them, become in their turn the support of its institutions, and know what the word patriotism signifies. The Empress on her side has founded numerous gymnasia (1873) for the instruction of all the classes of the female youth, and has liberally opened them to the girls of every religion. One of the noblest families of the country has also just founded a normal school to form professors for the natural sciences. Favourable expectations are also encouraged by some of the sects formed on the outside of the national Church, and, among others, by the spiritualistic sect of Duchoborzi, who, as the Quakers, believe in an internal and personal revelation, reject the sacraments, the worship of images, the merit of external practices; find in mysticism a way to escape from the slavery of the latter; admit miraculous narratives only in a spiritual point of view; and finally deny to the sacred books the character of an exclusive revelation. The Hellenic Church, on its side, since the emancipation of Greece, has also made advances in intellectual and religious culture. Since 1834, by reducing the number of convents, they have, by the sale of their property, created a fund for the support of popular and higher schools. In 1837, they founded the University of Athens, in which theological studies begin to be encouraged and developed by relations which Greece maintains with England, Germany, and other countries of the continent. M. Forschammer affirms that he has found in the cultivation of the interior of the Morea a population intelligent, in no way superstitious, rather Protestant in their religious tendencies; and among the Greek clergy, independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople, priests who have received a university education. Doubtless, the

teaching given in the different academies of the Greek rite will not soon break publicly with the symbols consecrated by the orthodox Church, which still enjoys great authority. But, as you may already see in the principal Russian preachers, the sense which they attach to them becomes constantly more spiritual; and the Greek doctors, in going back to the origin of their Church, will draw from the writings of those ancient and illustrious Fathers purer instructions than those which the Protestant Reformers drew from those of Augustine.

III.

PROGRESS IN RELIGIOUS LIFE AND MORALS.

THE progress of religious liberty, insufficient in itself, if it does not advance the reign of truth, would not be less insufficient were it not accompanied by a marked progress in the Christian life. It is to that the promoters of the revival principally aimed in the commencement of this century, and one of the first means that they set at work was the foundation of the Bible Society (1804). This excellent institution, although sometimes directed in a narrow and routine spirit, was a necessary supplement of the great revolution which, three centuries ago, put the gospel into the hands of the people. In indefinitely multiplying the copies and the translations of the sacred books, and in thus enabling each disciple to go back to the origin of his faith, to enter into constant contact with his Master and his model, the Bible became a powerful means of

Christian edification, and at the same time, in proportion as versions of it were ameliorated, and the knowledge and intelligence of its readers increased, a valuable auxiliary to the spirit of inquiry and the attainment of truth. Associations for the better observance of the Sabbath were also one of the important creations of the revival. Certainly, to recommend to all, and principally to those who have the disposal of others' labour, the observance of a seventh day of repose, was an eminent service rendered to religion and humanity. When you remove all useless rigour, all sombre and Puritanical excess; when you reconcile, in connection with it, the satisfaction of the wants of the soul and those of the intellect and social life, including the most seemly variations of the family circle and of friendship, which form the best part of the bodily repose necessary to the workman; when you remember how some religious communities of America and England begin practically to remember that "the Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," there is great reason for rejoicing at the efforts which are made for the consecration of Sunday. It is equally satisfactory that places of worship are multiplied wherever they are insufficient in number or kind to meet the wants of the population. Specially important is it that services should be given which suit the tastes and meet the wants of the neighbourhood. Sacred music offers a source of attraction and usefulness which has received some, but by no means adequate, attention. Then the old liturgies, so long and so full of repetition, need to be reformed; and prayers at once short, simple and carefully premeditated, coming directly from the soul, are specially needed, especially when free prayer is used. Finally, improvement in the sermon is imperative. A short address, not in general exceeding twenty minutes, on some point

bearing directly on the intimate wants and noble capacities of the soul, and generally on subjects of a practical kind, treated in a careful and striking manner, not without illustrative examples and instances, should supersede the wordy and tedious emptiness or declamation or dogmatic argumentation so common in the pulpit, which might be made the greatest instrument of religious impression and individual and social usefulness. In what concerns the direction of morals, the progressive Christian, from the very fact that he is vividly impressed with its intimate connection with Christianity, is careful to guard his own individualism, and while willing and eager to gather instruction from the lip as well as the pen, he is not less careful to guard against all sacerdotal pretensions whatever, especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." The benediction of the Church in calling God to witness the engagements of wedlock, assuredly increases its solemnity and ratifies its vows. But when the civil law required it as an indispensable condition of the validity of the contract, it put into the hands of the Roman clergy a weapon which it has not ceased to wield to the prejudice not only of religious liberty, but also of the sanctity of the union it was meant to consecrate. Marriage between couples of different religious communions, considering the interested demands of the priest, not being possible except on conditions which conscience has a right to refuse, is often changed into an immoral and illicit commerce. It is then a real advance in public morals which more and more takes out of the hands of the clergy the registers of the State, and, while recommending a religious service, makes it merely supplementary to the civil act, which is all that the State should require as necessary. In England,

this contract is at present performed under one or two objectionable conditions. The presence of the registrar at Nonconformist weddings would be unobjectionable if it was equally required in such as are celebrated by the episcopal clergy. It is one of the evils of an established church that it receives from the State privileges which are disqualifications for ministers of other religious bodies. Such favouritism must soon come to an end. The State has to do solely with a civil contract in this, as in every other matter. Not less objectionable is the difference that is made in regard to interment. If episcopalians desire consecrated ground, by all means let them have it, but not under such circumstances as stamp even on the grave an imprint of religious inequality and incompatibility.

The sufficiency of the civil attestation to marriage was decreed in France in 1789. It has been declared in our days in the different cantons of Switzerland, in the kingdom of Italy, and doubtless will soon be owned in all Germany. While waiting for the Catholic Church to abolish in general obligatory ecclesiastical marriage, as has already been done in Italy, it is important that the marriage of priests who have renounced their functions should be made legitimate. In the instruction of the young nothing is more important than the moral direction, and this direction is never better secured than when it is founded on religion. But when the clergy profit by the fact so as to claim as their duty and their right the superintendence of public instruction, they compel citizens and governments to call to mind in what spirit they have always performed the task. To form the judgment of the young, so necessary to enable them to understand the foundation and the reason of their duties; to imbue them with a sense of the duties which they will have to fulfil as citizens and future heads

of families; to prepare them for self-government by leading them to practise self-help, more than ever indispensable in our age,—this, which is the first duty of all competent teachers, is the last which the Catholic clergy has thought of; and even by Protestant ministers this has been superseded by indoctrination into the creeds and articles of their different churches. The clergy of all denominations must themselves receive a better training, a training more in unison with the spirit of the age, before they can be fit to be intrusted with the momentous task of forming the mind of the coming generation by moulding the mind of our youth. It is no wonder, while our clergy are enamoured of the spirit of the dark ages rather than the simple and loving spirit of Jesus, that some have gone to the extreme of declaring morality independent of religion. The sole cure of this extravagance is to make the religion taught in our schools the religion of Jesus in all its active simplicity and impressiveness, as construed and held by the most religiously advanced minds of our age. After the sad discoveries of the lamentable condition of large masses of our populations made as a sequel to our modern revolutions, the interests of public morality have assumed the highest importance in the minds of the religious friends of humanity. Qualities there are, and but too numerous and threatening, which suggest that society is sleeping on a social volcano. To remove these evils, societies have been formed of a purely practical as well as benevolent kind, which disown the disturbing and perverting influences of sect, creed, church and party. These are among the wisest instruments for good. Thus asylums have been opened for the recovery of polluted women, for the reformation of neglected and vicious children; refuges for vagabonds, homes for discharged seamen. The celebrated Quakeress,

Elizabeth Fry, gave a noble example by traversing Europe and America in order to carry into prisons the counsels and consolations of the gospel (1845). Almost everywhere the penitentiary system, destined for the regeneration of criminals, has taken place of the purely coercive system, and brought about the mitigation of the penal legislation. Not to mention other works of pure and wise Christian beneficence, the ravages of drunkenness have drawn the attention of philanthropists and legislators. Father Matthew founded for Ireland, demoralized by this plague, Temperance Societies, whose members took a pledge to abstain altogether from intoxicating drinks. In our days, in view of the innumerable crimes engendered by intoxication, governments have felt it a duty to subject the trade in such beverage to special restraints. Here indeed is a sin which seems to be spreading, and which certainly demands immediate and efficacious remedies. Never, however, was there an instance which illustrated more decisively the wisdom of the maxim, that prevention is better than cure; and the application of that maxim in educatory and refining influences of all kinds, nor least those which mingle amusement and recreation with instruction, is of great and immediate necessity.

These general remarks in favour of practical Christian beneficence we shall conclude with remarks on three great pests which this age has inherited from the past—slavery, war and pauperism—in the treatment of which Christianity has won many a laurel.

1. The Quakers, under impulses from George Fox and William Penn, were the first to adopt and to carry into effect in their American colonies resolutions for the abolition of slavery. In the other colonies, those of the North especially, at the time of the declaration of Independence,

measures having the same object were carried into effect (1782). In Denmark, their example was followed in 1804. It would have been so in the same period in England, when Clarkson and Granville Sharp warmly pleaded the cause of the slaves, if the massacre of the planters of Saint Domingo (1793) by the blacks, whom the French revolution had too suddenly enfranchised, had not for a time suppressed the aspirations of Christian benevolence. Notwithstanding the perseverance of Wilberforce, seconded by the eloquence of Pitt and Fox, it was only in 1807, after a speech by Sir Samuel Romilly, that the Parliament of England, in a transport of enthusiasm, passed a bill for the abolition of slavery. In 1824, on the motion of Canning, the slave-trade, assimilated to piracy, was punished by forced labour; at the same time, to destroy it in its source, cruisers placed on the Western shores of Africa were directed to capture vessels loaded with negroes, and to transport the rescued slaves to the colony of Sierra Leone, where missionaries laboured to civilize them by means of Christianity. Finally, in 1834, after the vote of a just indemnity for the proprietors of slaves, those of the English colonies were set at liberty, in connection with a time of apprenticeship or noviciate intended to prepare them for their new condition.

Nevertheless, despite the treaties of 1814, the American planters of the South, by means of factories which they supported on the coast of Africa, deceived the vigilance of the English cruisers, and carried on an active trade in negroes, which they purchased from the kings of the country. Without paying attention to the Bull of Gregory XVI. (1839) which condemned slavery, they hanged, without trial, the principal abolitionists, and the negroes who listened to them; the missionaries themselves, intimi-

dated, could do nothing but preach patience to the poor wretches, on the utterly untenable ground that, being of the race of Ham, they had to expiate his crime in their sufferings. Finally, speculating on the interests of the manufacturers of the North, who bought at a low price the cotton cultivated in their colonies, the States of South America demanded and obtained from the Confederation a decree for the restitution of their fugitive slaves (1850). President Lincoln had the courage to revoke this base concession. This was the signal for the revolt of the South, which was subdued only after a sanguinary war of four years. The victory of the Northern States decided in the union the entire abolition of slavery. The Emperor of Brazil also suppressed it in his states (1865). This, however, does not prevent its re-appearing from time to time under diverse forms. Samuel Baker has defeated in the upper valley of the Nile (1873) a horde of brigands who, under the pretext of trading in ivory, carried on a traffic in slaves. After having delivered them, he subjected the country to the government of the Sultan. But slavery subsists still in some parts of Africa. Some twenty years ago, a new kind of trade in slaves established itself at Macao, under the deceptive designation of "emigration of the Chinese coolies." Informed of the frightful condition to which these slaves are subjected, slaves in reality though pretended volunteers, on the Portuguese vessels that bring them, the consuls of the principal Powers of Europe claimed and obtained their liberty, and a treaty with England now permits the recruitment of free labourers in India. If slavery was the plague of America, Asia and Africa, that of Russia was serfdom. It dated from the sixteenth century, when, after the expulsion of the Mongols, the Court of Moscow, to restore the country to culture, at-

tached the peasants to the soil. Alexander I. in a measure improved their condition. Alexander II., immediately after his ascending the throne, abolished serfdom on the lands dependent on the crown. Then, braving the menaces of the lords, he published a general edict for the emancipation of the serfs to the number of fifty millions, whose proprietors he indemnified, at the same time that he took precautions against the vagabondism of the enfranchised. Lately also, and after the capture of Khiva, the Russian government set at liberty the Persian slaves detained in that city (1873).

2. All the wars have not had motives as honourable, nor results as happy for humanity, as those which set the slaves of these different countries free; witness the war which still raged in Europe at the commencement of this century, and which, during more than twenty years, covered it with blood and ruin. When, finally, the peace was signed in 1815, ardent desires arose on all sides that that war might be the last. The pacific dreams of Henry IV., of the Abbé Saint Pierre, of the philosopher Kant, became those of all men of sense and Christian feeling. America joined its desires and efforts to those of Europe. Channing, who in the midst of the most brilliant exploits of Bonaparte spoke with indignation so eloquent against the spirit of conquest, founded, with Noah Worcester and other Christians, the society of "the Friends of Peace," and drew up the appeal in which the Congress of the United States was entreated to undertake "the grand and sublime office of pacificator of the world." At the same time the Society of Quakers founded an annual congress, in which it was mainly attempted to indicate in arbitration an efficacious as well as Christian means of settling the differences of nations. At the first apprehension of fresh hostilities,

these societies and meetings were multiplied. But in the interval popular opinion was strangely perverted. Historians had unduly extolled deeds of valour, the poets had celebrated them in song, the ministers of religion themselves had offered incense to warlike glory; the theories of a European equilibrium, those of nationalities, of natural frontiers, had found too many advocates among statesmen; finally, oppressed peoples, impatient to throw of their yoke, standing armies kept in wearying and unprofitable repose, pushed society to war too powerfully for it to be possible to avoid it. Also when it broke out again, rendered more formidable than ever by the destructive efficacy of new arms, all that Christian charity could accomplish, after redoubling its urgent appeals (1861-70), was to prepare consolations for its victims, to gather together under the inviolable banner of the Cross devoted volunteers, who should supply without distinction assistance to the wounded and to prisoners of all nations, and to gather funds for sowing the ravaged fields afresh, and to restore cottages in ruins.

This, however, was only a palliative which, if the friends of peace had been satisfied with, might have served chiefly to tranquillize the conscience of promoters of fresh wars. Accordingly, without allowing themselves to be discouraged by so many checks, those friends resumed their generous crusade with augmented ardour. But charity cannot subsist without justice. Real evils not repaired, contrary pretensions not reconciled, are, among nations as individuals, a perpetual seed of dissension, which it is indispensable to destroy. Perhaps in the degree in which international relations multiply, and the exchange of ideas becomes more easy and prompt, society will be led to approve and adopt the alternative of peace long recommended by the Quakers.

Perhaps when nations shall better understand their true interests and their mutual duties, there will be formed among them a general opinion powerful enough to impose itself on parties in litigation, to oblige the offender to repair his wrongs, the injured to be satisfied with an equitable reparation, to suppress self-love too intense and exacting; finally, to constitute, if not a permanent institution, by means of an international code and a universally acknowledged tribunal, at least in each particular case, a pacific means of arbitration like that to which recourse has been successfully had on several occasions, and to which England and the United States in particular not long since submitted their differences in the Conference of Geneva (1872). It is in this direction that to-day the most illustrious friends of peace are zealously labouring.

3. Unhappily all the evils of this world are enchained together and engender each other. War, which from all antiquity has given birth to slavery, is in its turn perpetuated by wretchedness. It is famine endemic among savage tribes that ceaselessly drives them into war. It was famine which, in the Middle Ages, threw floods upon floods of the barbarians of the North on the civilized countries of the South. And in our own days, but for the pauperism which incessantly troubles the nations, which maintains in them a constant state of disquiet and uncertainty, would the sovereigns seek so earnestly, would they find so easily, soldiers for their unjust wars, or demagogues the artizans of revolt, the instruments of revolution? To banish this plague from the bosom of the working classes, too much was expected from the immediate enfranchisement of labour. "It was with this liberation as with others, which, for not having been sufficiently prepared, caused in the lot of the populations perturbations

full of danger. . . The workman, having got out of the tutelage of his master, found himself charged with care for his own subsistence, and often out of condition to make the needful provision; the ordinary artizan, thrown without capital into the arena of universal competition, found himself unhorsed at the first rencontre; the law had emancipated him, want put him into a state of dependence; he is again obliged to hire out his services, to be harnessed to the chariot of general industry. But suddenly a crisis supervenes . . . the markets close, the manufacturer suspends production, or a new machine invented replaces human hands; the workman, whom the division of labour has transformed into a machine, finds no longer employment for his hands, and thousands endure hunger by the side of the accumulated products of their toil." Struck with the dangers with which this state of things threatens social order, and which are aggravated by the disturbance of the civil power, dreading especially the remedies which certain operators propose to apply to it, the governments, under the impulse of the elevated classes, have sought a preservative in returning to the religious doctrines of the past. They hoped that, preached by a privileged clergy who had the same interests as themselves to make authority respected, propagated by writers of credit, they would serve to retain the multitude in submission to order, cause maxims of obedience to power to penetrate into public morality, turn minds away from dangerous aspirations, and thus supply aid to the suppressive force of governments. We must, it was said, suppress in the poor man this unquiet want of improving his position, proscribe an indiscreet science which exaggerates to his eyes the extent of his privations; we need a theology which ceaselessly reminds him of the fall of humanity, the evils to which the

posterity of Adam is justly and irremediably condemned, and of which patience is the sole corrective. We have seen that the falseness of this calculation soon became manifest. The very privileges with which the clergy were invested, the interest they were supposed to possess in diffusing maxims of obedience, rendered them suspected by the people from the first. The organs of religion passed for servants of the opulent classes; the use which policy wished to extract from them turned at once against politics and religion.

Other Christians, less pre-occupied with their own dangers, more sympathetic with the sufferings of their brethren, have with generous eagerness sought the means of giving them aid. In nearly all Protestant churches, ministries have been instituted to assist the populations in their new wants; establishments have been founded, such as "Infirmaries" and "Hospital Sundays," to supply them with medical aid. One result is, that it is beginning to be felt that the labouring classes by small periodical contributions may, by acting in common, supply their own wants in sickness, apart from the pauperizing tendency there is to be feared in every eleemosynary movement. In Catholic churches, however, "the Little Sisters of Charity" have been added to the former "Sisters of Charity." In both communions we find dispensaries, houses of recovery, hospitals for the infirm, for the blind, for the deaf and dumb, for idiots, for lost children. Laws have regulated and limited for children the hours of labour in mills; societies of young laymen and laywomen have been organized for visiting and succouring the poor in their homes. In general, what distinguishes subventive charity in our age, is that it relies less on the co-operation of the state; that, being more individual, it is on that account more in-

telligent, more discriminating, more equitable, and not less salutary to him by whom it is exercised than beneficent for him who is its object. In critical moments, finally, and particularly in great calamities, it opens its hand wide and repairs innumerable losses. But purely subventive charity, however valuable to lessen evils which demand immediate succour, too often leaves the root behind, and sometimes even, from lack of discernment, only augments the evil it is meant to remove. Russia, it is said, superabounds in alms, yet nowhere is the lower class more wretched; the citizens scarcely form a hundredth part of the population. The ministration of alms, in a word, while solacing poverty, is all but powerless against pauperism; it creates, or at least leaves behind, that plague which, like an hereditary cancer, transmits from father to son a permanent state of distress and nakedness, a too prolific source of demoralization.

To labour to heal is the great task of our age; and here more than anywhere else is necessary, nay, indispensable, that union called for by Chalmers of Christian charity and science—the former a powerful motive which prompts research for the remedy, the other a valuable torch which aids its discovery. During the sequel of the events of 1848, the grave question of pauperism was agitated among the French publicists, when one of the most distinguished of them, turning over the leaves of an English book which had fallen into his hands, was delighted to find in it the solution so much desired and sought after. The author of this book, Dr. Channing, whom we have already seen at work against the plague of war and that of slavery, had from the beginning of his ministry in Boston been deeply interested in the condition of the labouring classes. But far from seeing in their agitations the effect of an inordi-

nate ambition which it was necessary to restrict, to put down at any cost, far from invoking against it pessimist and enslaving doctrines, too like those which make the Hindoo bend down under his misery, he saw there aspirations worthy of sympathy, the effect of that ascensional movement to which God successively calls social classes, and which the Christian, when he sees it free from violence and injustice, ought to feel himself called upon to second. The true policy, in agreement here as in all things with true religion, consists in facilitating to all access to the advantages which you desire to secure for yourself. It is not then a movement of restraint, but a principle and a means of elevation, which, according to him, you are to seek in Christianity. By its influence you ought to enlighten the poor as to his true interests, to fortify him against the vices which engender and perpetuate wretchedness, to fill him with confidence in that Great Being who crowns every virtuous effort, call forth in him the sentiment of the dignity of his origin and of his destiny. Then, without ever substituting your efforts for his, you must sustain him in his struggle against evil, smooth down his obstacles, aid him to get over his difficulties, hold out to him your hand when he totters, lift him up when he has fallen. It is in this spirit that Channing, not satisfied with lavishing on workpeople the admirable directions given in his "Social Works," founded in Boston, in concert with his friend Tuckerman, the "Ministry of the Poor," which has for object to visit, instruct, encourage by well-informed and pious Christians, without any distinction of belief, the indigent destitute of other succour. The same thought which animated Channing in America, animated in Switzerland, Peslatozzi; in Alsace, the pastor Oberlin; in Germany, Madame Sieveking and Dr. Wichern,

the founder of the Rauenhaus, near Hamburg. At an early day the last had pointed out to his fellow-citizens the ravages which irreligion caused in the poor class, the simultaneous growth of misery and immorality. In 1845, he established a seminary of instructors who, without any other aid than food and clothing, formed themselves there for the education of children, and whom he sent forth on all sides to direct schools and establishments of charity. The risings of 1848 and 1849 soon came to expose the double wound which he had indicated. After the insurrection was overcome, it was on all sides asked whether it was necessary periodically to have recourse to these violent means; whether these obstinate rebellions were not the symptom of a deep dissatisfaction, which ought to be removed by charitable institutions in order not to have incessantly to fight against it. At the appeal of the philanthropic Christian, people of high character put themselves to work. In a great assembly convoked at Wittenberg from all parts of Germany, "the Interior Mission" was founded, a vast association which has for its object "to remedy the temporal and spiritual miseries of the German people by the propagation of the gospel and paternal succours of Christian love." Among its numerous and various labours of kindness, let us mention the forty institutes which, in the space of a year, it opened, similar to that of Hamburg, for deserted and vicious children, and where more than ten thousand such have received, with the cares of hospitality, the benefits of a Christian education. In France, in Switzerland, in England, the same circumstances have occasioned the same reflections and called forth similar efforts. It is felt that it is imperative to give the labouring classes that education which, in the natural order of things, ought to precede their emancipation, and

which must, indeed, precede any emancipation which deserves to be called real. The elementary instruction which they receive in schools is no longer sufficient. It is necessary to communicate to them with the utmost clearness not only the knowledge required for the carrying on of their occupations, but the principles of domestic and social economy. It is necessary, by good methods of instruction, to develop in the youth the habit of reflecting; to form in him a sound judgment which may guide him in all the circumstances of his life; a well-cultivated spirit of initiative which shall permit him under all circumstances to become the artificer of his own well-being; and, which is necessary before all else, to inculcate on him the virtues of his condition, "signed, sealed and delivered" by the religion of Jesus. It would take a long time to enumerate the institutions which have come into existence in our own age to supply these new necessities. Free schools for children and adults, religious schools on Sunday and other days of the week, industrial schools for poor children, philotechnic associations for the workmen, professional schools for young agriculturists, popular teaching of the principles of political economy, societies for apprenticeship, for finding situations, societies of labour, saving banks, retreats for old age, provision for the future, co-operative societies of workmen, who put into a common fund their savings for the formation of a capital, societies of emigration, industrial establishments, villages and towns founded under the auspices of benevolent manufacturers and capitalists—an honourable example given by masters who, of their own accord, associate in their profits the industrious and honest workman, surround him with friendly patronage, aid him to make his labour fruitful, and thus pave his way to the possession of property,—such are the principal foundations suggested

by Christian good-will, by the formidable crises of our century, and which, by ameliorating the condition of the working classes, will attach them to the cause of order, right and justice, more surely than the employment of force.

Such, during three quarters of this century, has been the progress accomplished in the bosom of Christendom. Shall we not view with admiration how, scarcely awakened from a long slumber, and almost immediately solicited by contrary currents, equally threatening for faith, Christianity has made its way between them, and advanced towards its object in the triple direction which we have just traced out? Doubtless the progress is incomplete; before ideal perfection it will always be so; nevertheless it has been real. Our impatience has often accused it of slowness, and been irritated at seeing it interrupted or traversed; but perhaps it has only been the surer. It is in the way of evolution, not revolution, that nations truly progress. Minds need time for getting light; interests are not settled and harmonized all at once. Protestantism itself, from having been at the beginning compelled to arm itself with precipitation and even some violence against the crushing tyranny of Rome, has at the end of half a century seen itself slacken its pace, and even in some places to cease its conquests. In our days it is very far from having recovered its expansive force, and it is but indirectly, by the intermediation of spiritual philosophy and liberal Catholicism, that it makes breaches in the strongholds of Rome. To be connected with the past without being confined in it, to prepare the future without hastily anticipating it,—it is thus that society advances on the road of reformation, and the resistance which it meets with, when it does not extend so far as to suppress liberty, is a moderating power provi-

dential and sometimes necessary. Moreover, it is only justice to say in addition what follows. That progress, whose path we have attempted to lay down, has not been and could not be the work of any single party. It required the concurrence of a number of aptitudes, and consequently of diverse agents, who, without always understanding each other or according, have none the less co-operated. Even those whom their excessive predilection for the past has caused to receive the epithets of stationary and retrograde, have often given to works of piety, morality and beneficence, a concurrence active and generous which each ought to be ready to recognize. In a word, in the multiform and pregnant labour which Jesus bequeathed to his disciples, all cannot play the same part, for all have not received the same gifts; but if all, entering into the "more excellent way" which his apostle has traced out, employ for the common good and in a spirit of charity the gifts which they have severally received, Christian progress will go forward without limits and at once in all directions. Let us then not fear for the future of Christianity. The human race, finding it always at hand, no longer to impede but to forward it, to sustain it in its progressive advance, will never more be tempted to desert from its banner.

Let us now turn our eyes on another side, and after having studied the present situation of Christianity in Christian nations, let us examine it in other nations, which still form three-fourths of the population of the globe. Let us look at the actual state of its conflict with their different forms of worship, the favourable and unfavourable circumstances which its proselytism has met with among them, the checks which it has undergone, the victories which it has gained; finally, to what point it is on the way to extend its spiritual empire over the world.

Second Part.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG NON-CHRISTIANS.

Second Part.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG NON-CHRISTIANS.

CHAPTER I.

CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM.

Of all the religions foreign to Christianity that, the followers of which, although much less numerous, sustain most relations with Christians, is the religion of Israel. The Jewish population spread over the globe is valued at about eight millions of souls, one moiety of which at least inhabit divers countries of Europe. The prejudices, the antipathies, the rival interests, which in preceding ages animated the Christian populations against the Jewish have not entirely disappeared in our age. Scarcely had the Papacy been re-installed in Rome than the Jews were again banished into the *Ghetto;* very much later, when, in 1863, a certain number of them attempted to establish themselves at Velletri, the bishop of that city immediately expelled them from his diocese. The same contempt as heretofore, and the same denial of justice, were lavished upon them in the city of the Pontiffs; their children, sometimes fraudulently carried off and baptized,

then confined in houses for catechumens, like the boy Martara in 1858, were detained in spite of all protests. Sometimes also, in different countries, even in France, Holland and Germany, one has seen renewed against them, on the part of an ignorant crowd, the absurd accusations accredited in the Middle Ages, and the barbarous treatment to which they gave rise. The times of popular effervescence, the year 1816 for example, in Germany, have been particularly baneful to them. During the risings in Bohemia in 1848, especially in the cities where trade corporations still subsisted, several German Jews were shamefully massacred. In Roumania, when the new legislature wished to secure to the Jews religious liberty, the synagogue was pillaged and destroyed, and a crowd of Israelites maltreated; one of the ministers, to render himself popular, revived an old law which excluded the Jews from the right to have farms or keep hotels, as well as to purchase property. They were also hunted in great numbers from the provinces of Moldavia, where they resided; taking refuge in Jassy, they underwent new vexations, not only on the part of the people, who feared their competition in commerce, but also on the part of the nobility, whose creditors they were. Under Frederick William IV. the idea of a "Christian State" caused them to be refused the right to marry Christian women and to teach as professors in schools and universities. In Russia, the policy of the Emperor Nicholas was even more contrary to them. In 1844 particularly, the Polish Jews, accused of smuggling, were violently transported into the middle of the country. In Switzerland, several cantons, and those the most democratic, such as Argovia and Bâle-Campagne, long refused them their civil and political rights. However, you must not judge from these particular instances of the general

situation of the Jews in our century. The same circumstances which, despite confessional prejudices, do not cease to advance the reign of religious liberty and equality to the profit of Catholics and Protestants, equally promote the cause of the emancipation of the Jews; among these circumstances we particularly note the increasing liberty of commerce, the suppression of absurd laws on the amount of interest to be paid for money, the progressive abolition of trades' unions, the importance gained by able financiers of that nation in their competition in great industrial enterprizes. Let us add to the honour of the Israelites, that in this age, as well and even better than in the preceding, rarely has one seen an oppressed religious minority gain success like them: this has been done by their activity and energy, and by their making themselves necessary to their oppressors, so that they have made for themselves a place in societies where they had long been denied access. Not only in commerce and finance, but in letters, the arts, the sciences, industry, politics, and even in arms, numbers of Jews have made their way to an elevated position. They have moreover distinguished themselves by their sobriety, their domestic virtues, their patriotism, of which they have given proofs on several occasions—in Prussia, for example, during the war of independence; finally, by their spirit of mutual good-will, which, exercising itself more judiciously, labours to communicate instruction to their indigent. All this could not fail in time to conciliate public opinion and the favour of enlightened governments. We have seen how, towards the end of the last century, the United States, and following them the French Republic, took in this respect a glorious initiative. However, Napoleon I., during his sojourn in Germany and at his return through Alsace, having received grave complaints on the

exorbitant claims of the Jews in regard to their debtors, resolved, before confirming them in the new rights which the Republic had bestowed on them, to demand guarantees that they would shew themselves worthy of the favour. He assembled deputies of the Jews from all parts of the French Empire, and put to them a series of questions relative to the manner in which they understood their obligations as citizens. A commission was appointed, and the assembly, at his request, having replied in a satisfactory manner to these questions, Napoleon, in order to imprint on these replies a permanent authority, which made them into positive rules, instituted the great Sanhedrim, which sanctioned them and was charged to watch over their observance. Some momentary reserves, made on the rights of the Jews, with a view to humour the susceptibilities of the Church, disappeared by little and little, and were completely effaced after the Revolution of 1830. The Israelite worship, like the worship of the Christians, was from that moment supported by the State; in return, the government of Louis Philippe, in 1844, fixed the salaries and the influence of the consistories presiding over that religion, and subjected the rabbis, as well as the other ecclesiastics, to correction before the Council of State. The emancipation of the Jews by Napoleon I. extended to Holland and Belgium, where it has since maintained itself; to a part of Germany, where it underwent restrictions after the restoration of 1815 and 1849; finally, to Italy, where it was fully recognized only in 1850 by the statute of Victor Emmanuel, and in 1870 for the Roman States. France, wherever its influence has extended, has not ceased to protect the Jews in the exercise of their rights, and to interest the European powers in their cause. Those of Roumania owed to it the abolition of the decree of expulsion hurled

against them (1866). About the same time, in sanctioning a treaty of commerce with Switzerland, it stipulated that its Israelite subjects should freely settle there, and thus forced several cantons, still recalcitrant, to adhere to that act of justice in such a way that, in the revision of the federal constitution, the right of free settlement, declared independent of the religious profession, should be extended to the Israelites; it will be so more largely still, without doubt, in the approaching revision.

In England, their emancipation, undertaken in 1830, had to encounter many more obstacles. The prejudices were such, that in 1827 citizenship had been refused to a Christian merchant because his father was a Jew. In 1830, the Israelites were admitted to those privileges on taking an oath on the Old Testament. Five years after, the Jew Salomon was elected Sheriff of London and Middlesex; but to maintain him in that double dignity it was necessary each year by a special act to strain the oath he had to take. The difficulties increased when the question of the admission of Jews to Parliament came to be entertained. Though voted by the House of Commons, it was every year rejected by the House of Lords until in 1858, when the Commons having, without an oath, seated in one of their Committees a celebrated Israelite financier recently elected, the Upper House, which prefers granting of its own free will the liberal measures which it is threatened with seeing accomplished in spite of it, faithful to its tactics in 1829, authorized the House of Commons to henceforth require of the Jews no other oath than that which they took before the courts of law. Thus were the from thirty to forty thousand Jews emancipated that have their homes in England. Their emancipation had not to wait much longer in Russia, where, begun by

Alexander I. and interrupted by Nicholas, it was all but completed under Alexander II. In Würtemberg it was declared in 1861, and since the reign of William I. in the rest of Germany. In 1864, the Jews were admitted at Frankfort to the exercise of all civil and political rights. Mecklenburg and Limburg, which were most in the rear in this matter, have, as well as the city of Cracovia, adopted new measures of toleration (1868). We may indeed assert that henceforth, in most Christian lands, the cause of the liberties of the Jews is all but gained. The progressive amelioration established in the civil relations of the Jews and the Christians, has naturally brought about between them an approximation which one hopes to see turn to the advantage of Christianity. In the last century, John Muller of Gotha, Hermann Franke, Callenberg, Zinzendorf and his Moravians, had already profited thereby to organize missions to the Israelites.

In Germany, however, the zeal had grown somewhat cold, when in England the London Missionary Society placed, in 1809, the conversion of the Jews in the circle of its labours. This example has been followed by the majority of similar societies on the two continents. Several occupy themselves especially with the task. In 1863, they had in their service about two hundred missionaries, of whom one hundred work in England alone. The number of Jews baptized since the beginning of the century is reckoned at about twenty thousand. The circulation of the New Testament, the circulation of tracts, whether in Hebrew or in the modern tongues, the establishment of schools for young Israelites, and of a regular form of worship for adults, the publication of a journal under the name of "The Friend of Israel," chapels for the converted Jews, seminaries conducted by those of the Jews who de-

vote themselves to the conversion of their fellow-believers, workshops for those whom their conversion might deprive of their former means of support; in Jerusalem, Christian worship and a bishop established on Mount Zion by the united efforts of the two Courts of Prussia and England;—such, besides the missions properly so called, are the principal means of Christian proselytism set in action for the conversion of the Jews. The success obtained hitherto has not been proportioned to so many efforts. Among those who are most zealously employed in it, several complain that they find the soil continually more unproductive. One who had been a rabbi, but now converted and a missionary in Bessarabia, wrote recently that from Odessa and other places Israelites come to him to be instructed in the gospel, but that during seven months out of one hundred and fifty he had been able to baptize only eighteen. The Society of Bâle, in 1843, counted only one proselyte; at Jerusalem, in one year (1857-8), Gobat baptized only fifteen. Many Jews of Palestine and Syria turn to their own account the credulity of the missionaries by trafficking in the Bibles they receive, and by selling their apostasy three or four times to Christians disposed to give a high price for it. Sincere and durable conversions are obtained rarely. The dogmas of the Trinity, the divine nature of Jesus, scandalize their absolute Monotheism; that of expiation by blood repels the enlightened Jews. "Retrench those dogmas of your Christianity," they said to a missionary; "we shall then be more ready to listen to you." "What keeps us at a distance from your religion," said another, "is the number of new doctrines which you have introduced into it; but if Jesus himself were to re-appear on earth, we should be among his most ardent followers." As to the prospect which, on the authority of the prophet

Hosea (xiv.), the missionaries display before their eyes of returning to Jerusalem in a body under the guidance of Jesus, it seems to touch most of them very little. Ubi bene, ibi patria (Where you are well off, there is your country), is their motto. Since their lot has been improved in the different countries where they reside, since they find there, with easy circumstances, personal liberty and dignity, they wish nothing more for this life; and for the other, the kingdom of heaven seems to them preferable to the reign in Jerusalem. They leave to the ignorant Jews of Poland, ill-treated and miserable in that country, the *ignis fatuus* of Canaan. They lose from sight the heritage of Jacob. "We enjoy ourselves where we are," they reply, "and we care little about going to Jerusalem to live under the yoke of the Turks." A Jewish Synod held in 1868 at Leipzig, where twenty-five rabbis were present, formally rejected the notion of a restoration of Israel and the liturgies which relate to it.

Thus authors whose judgment has weight in this matter depend, in what relates to the conversion of the Jews, much less on the missions properly so called than on the internal movement which is taking place in the bosom of Judaism itself; on the part, continually increasing, which this people—thanks to the increase of toleration—take in the intellectual and religious activities of the Christian nations in the midst of which they reside, and on the progressive change which insensibly ensues in the separating beliefs.

As much as in preceding ages the Jews, to resist the oppression of which they were the objects, grouped themselves closely around their distinctive doctrines and practices, so much in our days, in the countries where all corners are open to them, they conform to the institutions

of those countries, enter into the current of Christian civilization, and in the same degree detach themselves from the traditions and narrow observances of their forefathers. It is, as has been well said by an English writer, the old history of Phœbus and Boreas: "The cloak which they drew around themselves all the more closely the more violent the gale of persecution, opens now and falls of itself under the gentle influence of sympathy and respect." That cloak is the Talmud. For ages considered as divine by all the Jews, and now still by the orthodox Jews, it has lost, if not its attraction, at least its authority, over the best-informed and most intelligent amongst them. This anti-Talmudist movement, which is carried back to Maimonides, which in modern times was renewed by Spinoza, and thrown into relief in the last century in Germany by the labours of Mendelssohn, has in our day, under the influence of causes which we have just indicated, taken much more extent and consistency, principally in the cities of Berlin, Hamburg and Frankfort. In the last place, a numerous assembly of Jews, coming from different parts of Germany, published (1843) a confession of faith in three articles, of which the first recognized in the Mosaic religion the possibility of indefinite progress, the second declared the authority of the Talmud null, the third exhorted the Jews to consider as their only country the land where they were born. A multitude of German Israelites forthwith attached themselves to this programme, abandoned their ancient ritual, several even the ceremonial law of the Pentateuch, refused to present their children for circumcision, and renounced the distinction of clean and unclean meats. They bear the name of "The Newly Reformed." Other rabbis assembled afterwards in Brunswick and Frankfort, while condemning those reforms, were

themselves drawn by the spirit of the age to concessions which in the eyes of orthodox Jews passed for apostasy. They renounced the Talmud, took the Old Testament for their only guide, published it in the vulgar tongue, prayed in the same tongue and in abridged forms, lessened the authority of Rabbinism, and sought well-instructed rabbis for their synagogues. Despite the resistance of the Talmudists, specially numerous on the other side of the Vistula, the reform movement has gradually extended; a Jewish university founded at Berlin tolerates or favours in its theologians very bold doctrines. If the Jews of Holland, Belgium and France, shew themselves more submissive to the received doctrine, that external orthodoxy comes, it is said, a good deal from indifference; while in England a branch of Israelites has been formed which begins to meet with a certain toleration in their co-religionists. When once, then, the two barriers are beaten down which of old kept the Jews rigorously separated from the Christians—I mean the intolerance of these, the Talmudic fanaticism of those—there will arise between the two populations a community of ideas and interests which, if it turns to the advantage of one of those forms of worship, will naturally turn to that of the less imperfect. In Würtemberg, from the promulgation of the law which prepared for the emancipation of the Israelites, they shared more and more in the agricultural and industrial life of the country, and borrowed from it its system of schools and institutions of beneficence. Even in their form of worship there were remarkable signs of approximation to the Christian side. Among these were preaching in German, confirmation with forms borrowed from the Protestant liturgy, a book of hymns taken in part from the Lutheran service. In America, Jews are seen contributing

generously to the erection of Christian chapels. Those of Offenbach, near Frankfort, those of Königsberg, substituted Sunday for Saturday as the day of rest. Two great rabbis, one of Austria, the other of Frankfort, did the same. Recently new concessions are made (1857) to the modern spirit. Besides the substitution of Sunday for Saturday, the vulgar tongue for Hebrew in worship, the suppression of superannuated rites, they admit as true worship only "that which penetrates and vivifies the heart;" they deny all the baneful consequences attributed to the sin of the first man, and declare man capable of advancing in moral perfection by the due employment of his faculties. "Now," says an Israelite member of the French Institute, "now that all social careers are open to us, we become attached to an order of things in which we hope to see our families prosper. We serve with you, we study with you; our sons in the colleges contract with yours friendships which last for life. On quitting their home, where they were bound to the old traditions, without ceasing to respect them, they cease to observe them; drawn on by the current of your civilization, they renounce our old formalism. The sole obstacle to a complete approximation of ideas is the Christian mythology; it is particularly the dogmas of the Incarnation and the Trinity. Without being, any more than Mendelssohn, disposed to quit our own community to embrace Christianity, like him we feel for Jesus the most respectful sympathy; we venerate in Paul the courageous apostle that broke the narrow mould in which the Israelite theism was imprisoned, and proclaimed the fine thought of the human brotherhood. In the Christian Church we recognize the powerful means of which Providence has made use for spreading in the world the elements of general

civilization which the religion of our legislation contained in germ."

In view of such declarations, one would be ill disposed if one for a moment required from the children of Israel more complete testimonies of religious fraternity. But it must be added, that among all the forms of Christianity, progressive Christianity is in a condition to obtain utterances of the kind. It is, then, in the province of progress that the followers of the two forms of worship meet in future and may some day unite. Accordingly, at the Peace congress of 1869, you saw the representative of liberal Catholicism unite with the representatives of liberal Protestantism and liberal Judaism, to proclaim those three forms as the only ones that have a future in the civilized world.

CHAPTER II.

CHRISTIANITY AND MOHAMEDANISM.

THE relations of Christianity with the religion of Mohamed are quite different from those which it sustains with Judaism. While the Israelite people is all but entirely subject to Christian governments, millions of Christians, orthodox or schismatic Greeks, are subject to the Moslem domination, whose yoke, although made somewhat lighter in modern days, does none the less offer great obstacles to the progress and influence of Christianity, and at certain times and in certain places threaten even its existence.

The Greek orthodox Church, with its four patriarchates, which comprise in European Turkey eleven millions of souls, with four in Asiatic Turkey, preserves under the sway of the Sultans its position as an established Church, but is oppressed, or at least precariously tolerated. The Patriarch of Constantinople, considered as a high dignitary, exercises in that quality civil jurisdiction over the members of his flock; but he is not recognized by the Sultan except after having paid an exorbitant sum, which he raises on the bishops his subordinates, the weight of which falls ultimately on the people. Moreover, besides the imposts to which every Turkish subject is liable, the Christians pay

a number of extraordinary taxes, all but crushing in their totality, and are besides exposed to the arbitrary tyranny of the Pashas. Nowhere is the despotism more severely felt than in Africa, Hellas, the Morea and Albania. The massacre of the Patriarch of Constantinople on Passover day before the gates of his palace, called forth the Greek insurrection in 1821; the people of the Morea and the islands arose and fought bravely for nine entire years, until the European powers, under the pressure of liberal opinion, went to the aid of the Greeks, and combined (1829) to recognize their independence and to erect Greece into a Christian kingdom, though with frontiers which a selfish policy made as narrow as possible.

On different occasions these same powers, Russia in particular—whose policy, as well as its religion, renders it the natural protector of Oriental Christians—profited by the decay of the Turkish Government to exact from it more humane treatment. In 1839, the Sultan had to sign the Edict of Gulhané, which declared the Christians and the Moslems equal before the law. This Edict was so badly executed, that the Greeks, driven to extremes, revolted several times, and that Russia, intervening afresh, claimed a protectorate which seemed to threaten the European equilibrium and gave occasion to the war of the Crimea. England and France, before declaring in favour of the Sultan, demanded of him engagements of toleration (1854), which at the end of the war he had to renew by his "Hatti-Humaioun" (1859). This Edict, not less illusory than that of Gulhané, only disclosed the Moslem fanaticism, which manifested itself in different provinces, notably at Djeddah, the port of Mecca, by acts of savage violence, and turned against the government itself, which attempted to restrain it. On new complaints made by Russia, the

Sultan, threatened with a Congress, which might have ended in the dismemberment of his states, undertook to make a serious inquiry against the authors of the massacres. After the repression of the revolt of the island of Crete (1867), new representations of the Powers, new promises, which the Sultans perhaps would desire to keep, if the Muftis left them the power. It is admirable that such a state of oppression which has existed for four centuries has so rarely shaken the fidelity of the Greek Christians. If we except the nobility of Bosnia, where there is a considerable number of apostates, and Bulgaria, where, rather than again belong to the Church of Constantinople, of which it was independent till the year 1764, some villages have embraced Islamism, the great mass of the Christians of the Greek rite have resisted all temptation to abjure their faith. But on their side, in their condition of servitude, they could not hope, any more than the Catholic and Protestant missionaries spread over the Turkish empire, to effect in the Moslem population even a few conversions. The severity of the Turkish Government strikes specially those of its subjects that are guilty of apostasy. According to the Koran, the Moslem renegade is punishable with death, and this penalty has occasionally been inflicted in our century with horrible accessories, which occasioned the intervention of the Christian Powers, and caused to be inserted in the decree of 1856 a clause guaranteeing liberty for Turkish subjects that embraced Christianity, but with the obligation, in the case of those who did so, to quit Stamboul, and with the missionaries to retire into the Frank quarter, or to disperse in the provinces. The old penalty has then been abolished. But scarcely was it necessary to prevent all thought of apostasy in a nation animated with sovereign contempt for whatever is foreign, assured that it

alone professes the pure Monotheism, nursed in the prejudice by an almost complete absence of intellectual culture, and knowing scarcely any other literature than the text and the numberless commentaries of the Koran. More than seventy thousand pilgrims go every year to worship at Mecca, where thousands of animals are immolated in commemoration of Abraham's sacrifice. In India, the Moslems are, of all the inhabitants, the most inaccessible to Christian preaching. There, with passionate fanaticism, they prepare (1857) revolt against the English rule. The missionaries in particular have very much to suffer from their fury. The only mission somewhat flourishing among them—somewhat flourishing because its conditions are much more favourable—is that which the Greek clergy carries on among the Moslems which people some provinces of the Russian empire, whose centre is Tiflis. A thousand disciples of Mohamed received baptism in 1858. Everywhere else, as in Syria and Palestine, even in Jerusalem, where the bishopric founded by England and Prussia directed the Christian propagandism, the influence of the Christian missionaries on the Moslems is almost null; all that they can do is to attract into their schools a certain number who come there to get a little profane instruction, to the exclusion of all religious teaching whatever. Here also there is advantage to be hoped for from the internal movement which is taking place in Islamism by the sects formed at different times. Independently of the anti-traditional sect of the Shyites, and of the mystic sect of Sophis, all but contemporaneous with Mohamed, and which are still numerous in Persia, independently of the rationalist sect of Wahabites which, at the beginning of this century, succeeded in getting possession of Mecca, and which, though vanquished and dispersed by Mohamed-

Ali, has left shoots in Arabia, there have arisen at Chiraz, in modern times, two new sects still more independent on ancient Islamism, that of the Nossayris, and specially that of the Babys, who, relying on mystic principles, reject the superstitious precepts of legal purity, polygamy, the seclusion of women, attempt to reform education, and finally distinguish themselves by their universal sociability. The founder of this last sect (1843-52), the Bâb, attacked and overcome by the Shah of Persia, over whom he at first gained some advantages, suffered a cruel death with martyr courage; but he left after him devoted disciples, who transferred the seat of the sect to Bagdad, and whose principles, like their master's, approach Christianity. Another mystic association of the same kind, and which reminds you, it is said, of that of the Quakers, was founded at Broussa, in Asiatic Turkey; its head has been recently incarcerated in Constantinople.

These interior reforms attempted in Islamism, and evidently born of communication with the Europeans, seem to announce what will be the effects of the yet nearer approximation which must come from the rapid progress of the ascendancy and domination in the East of Christian Powers. In our age, Russia, continuing its victorious march, has taken from the Turks the provinces between the Dnieper and the Danube (1809-12); then, as a result of the wars against Persia (1829), a part of Turkish Armenia. The revolts of the Viceroy of Egypt obliged the Sultan to put himself at the mercy of the Czars, and to open the Bosphorus to them, which, closed for a moment after the taking of Sebastopol, was re-opened by the treaty of London (1871). Recently his armies advanced into Turkestan, captured Khiva, received the submission of the Moslem peoples who border on it, and approached nearer

and nearer to India, where England on its part pursues its gigantic advances, subjecting, one after the other, the provinces of the dismembered empire of the Mongols; so that on the platform of Upper Asia, Islamism is surrounded by the ascendancy of these two great Christian powers. At the same time France, since 1830 mistress of Algeria, and since 1856 of Kabylia, extended its conquests over nearly all the northern littoral of Africa. Spain took possession of a part of Morocco. Finally, since the liberation of the Morea, other provinces prepare to throw off the Turkish yoke. The union of the Danubian provinces, as a sequel of the war of the Crimea, has already procured for them a demi-independence. Montenegro, Albania, Servia, threaten the Porte with an approaching insurrection; Crete in revolt was reduced only by the greatest efforts. Finally, it may be said that the Ottoman empire has only a name to be reckoned among the states of Europe. Probably it would have already ceased to exist if the important position of Constantinople, and the fear of the encroachments of Russia, had not prevented the Christian powers from extending their sway in that direction. In vain now for sixty years have the Sultans made great efforts to restore the forces of their empire; in vain have they removed the obstacle opposed to them by the Janissaries (1826); opened schools, authorized journals, prepared the re-organization of justice; in vain one of them, returning home from his travels, announced the most imposing projects; they have at once to struggle against the apathy of their populations, the fanaticism of their Imauns, the incapacity of their ministers, and, before all, the exhaustion of their finances; and when, to repair that evil, they shall, as they are believed to intend, lay their hands on the property of the mosques, it will be a formidable attack on Islamism, which

is supported by its immense possessions. Still more, in countries already conquered by the European powers, the perpetual contact of Christian civilization produces in Moslem ideas and usages a gradual alteration which insensibly saps the authority of the Koran, and prepares the ground for the preponderance of Christianity.

Meanwhile the powers of Europe ought not, for miserable struggles to gain influence and adjust equilibriums, to continue to shackle the aspiration of Christian nations still subject to the Turkish yoke, and—as was seen at the time of the emancipation of Greece, the revolt of the Pasha of Egypt, the troubles of Syria and the island of Crete—to prevent the Greek Christians from coming to an understanding, and to confederate in order to conquer their independence. Still less should those same rivalries hinder them in future from concerting to stop the course of violence of which the Christian populations of the East have so often been the victims; the Nestorians in Kurdistan, the Armenians in Mount Taurus (1842), the Maronites in the Lebanon (1862), where a hundred and fifty villages, with the secret connivance of the Turkish troops, were set on fire by the Druses (1860). To prevent the renewal of such acts of barbarity, it would be well to keep the Sultan under the control of fear. On these conditions we may hope to see Christianity profit by the decay of the Moslem states, so as to put its foot firmly on their territory; while on its side Islamism, which still bears sway in the Pagan countries of Africa, Australia and part of the Indies, may, in propagating Monotheism, become there, as it specially becomes in the interior of Africa, the forerunner of civilization.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIANITY AND POLYTHEISM.

THE Pagan tribes, which to-day form more than a moiety of the population of the globe, occupy the most diverse degrees in the social scale: some, like the Papous of Milanesia, are still in the lowest and grossest state of savageness; others, like the Hindoos, the Chinese, the Japanese, possess a certain degree of civilization; among these, finally, all the imaginable degrees of barbarism or semi-barbarism. Although the method followed and the results obtained in their evangelization differ in the same proportion, we evidently cannot give an account of all those differences. Still less can we attempt to follow, country after country, the missionary work undertaken in our days on nearly all points of the idolatrous world. Besides the time which it would require, the results still present here and there too much uncertainty. After having, in many a country, given brilliant expectations, they all of a sudden come to a stop, or are even annulled by accidental circumstances. We must then here be satisfied with general views on the new flight which this work has taken in our century, the diverse processes which have been employed, the success already obtained, and the prospects which it offers in the future.

The Roman Church, which, until the last century, had almost alone conducted the work of missions among the Pagans, found itself suddenly paralyzed in its enterprize by the union of different causes. The diminution of its resources, the discredit into which the religious orders had fallen, the decay of the principal Catholic powers, the wars in which they had lost most of their colonies; finally, the embarrassment of the Papacy, and the suppression of their two great missionary seminaries,—had placed a thousand obstacles in the way of its propagating efforts. In our days more favourable circumstances have presented themselves for it. The peace of 1815 opened the ocean to it; lacking the ships of Spain and Portugal, it has those of France at its disposal; its two seminaries were restored, and owing to the encouragements lavished by Pius VII., Gregory XVI. and his successors, found donors and pupils. The House of Foreign Missions, which in 1822 had only twenty students, counted a hundred twenty years after. The "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith," circulated to the extent of nearly two hundred thousand copies, have popularized the work of the Roman missionaries. New religious orders, the Passionists, the Redemptorists, the Oblates of Marseilles and others, associated themselves with their predecessors. Every year some of their members are sent either to reinforce the old stations at Ceylon, in China, in Japan, in Indo-China, in the Indian Archipelago, of old colonized by the Portuguese and the Spaniards, or to found new missions in the Pacific Ocean, under the protectorate of France. The annual resources of the Catholic propagandism amount to-day to more than two hundred thousand pounds. The Russian Church itself has been less indisposed to mission work than is sometimes supposed; but with it that work is done less by

independent missionaries, belonging to different orders or religious parties, than by the national priests, under the direction of the bishops. We have seen with what jealous care the Emperor Nicholas drove from his territory the Moravian missionaries and others that had established stations there. Although his successor relaxed this system of exclusion, the Russian bishops remain specially charged with the evangelization of the Pagans spread over their vast dioceses. In the north and the south of the country their zeal has been exercised in five principal stations, and with a certain success among the Kalmucks of Astrachan and the Samoyedes of Archangel, given up previously to the grossest Shamanism. The movement of the Protestant missions is far more powerful. As early as the end of the last century, the immense progress of the dominion of the English in India, their voyages and discoveries in Oceania, the search for and the acquisition of new colonies to replace those of North America, the duty of moralizing the negroes which they enfranchised,—all this claimed a new degree of activity on the part of their missionaries. The peace with North America concluded in 1814, the European peace of 1815, in establishing new bonds between the Protestant states, gave them an opportunity for combining for the missionary enterprize, set minds free from exclusively political pre-occupations, left capital disposable for philanthropic and religious undertakings, opened the way in missionary employment for a crowd of young people previously carried off by war, and shewed a new career to those whose character inclined in favour of a religious and benevolent vocation. From the year 1815, new missionary societies, with which, as well as with the old ones, auxiliary associations were connected, were founded in Germany, Switzerland and France. In 1869, there were forty-two

mother societies, having under their direction eighteen hundred missionaries, in all nearly ten thousand agents, and annually disposing of a total revenue of more than a million sterling: to such an extent does the spirit of free association among the Protestants shew itself in this regard, as in so many others, more powerful and more prolific than the official organism of the Greek or Roman unity. A single glance thrown on the Atlas of Missions suffices to establish this superiority. The Russian stations, as we have seen, are opened exclusively on the surface or in the vicinity of the territory of the empire; the Catholic stations exist nearly all on the boundaries; while those of the Protestants, much more numerous, penetrate into the heart of countries yet Pagan.

The most active societies in this work are naturally those of maritime nations; among them, the most manufacturing and commercial, and so the most interested in opening new outlets for their goods, in forming relations with young populations, having numerous wants to satisfy. For them, as Livingstone made no scruple to declare, it is a national work as well as a religious one. England occupies the first position therein; its higher classes, as well as its middle classes, shew themselves equally devoted to the duty. "What," says M. Esquiros, "it cannot conquer by arms, it seeks to assimilate by beliefs; by its missionaries it succeeds in reigning over many peoples whom it has not subdued." Accordingly it alone furnishes nearly two-thirds of the missionary agents, as well as of the sums of money, consecrated to the purpose. It is greatly aided by its colonizing spirit, and by the tendency to emigration which ensues in it from a population too large for the resources of the country. Among those emigrants, the number of whom, since 1815 only, has reached in the

New World the figure of more than six millions of souls, many, instead of seeking by chance the means of existence, put their diverse aptitudes and talents at the service of the missionary societies. After England came the United States of America, whose population is not less industrial and enterprizing. Then came the Dutch and the Danes, who have never attempted to conceal the fact that their labours for the evangelization of distant countries had in great part for its object the extension of their commerce and the strengthening of their colonies. The Protestant sects, less restrained in their movements than the national churches, more accustomed to rely on their own resources, exercising over their members a more direct authority—finally, more active in religious revival, are so as well in foreign missions: in this respect they form the correlative of the monastic orders. Such, from their origin, have been the Methodists, especially the Wesleyans; in the same line work the Baptists, the Moravians, &c. Nevertheless, the national churches are not disposed to leave them the monopoly of these efforts; and while, in the last century, all the friends of missions considered them as common ground on which they could work together, in this century the Anglicans and the ultra-Lutherans have wished to have their societies directed exclusively by themselves.

You also see in the different Protestant communions the distinction observable at all times between the zeal which labours for the propagation of Christianity and that which labours for its purification. As, since the Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Catholic Church long presided alone over the conversion of the Pagans, and while the religious orders which shewed themselves most devoted to the work were also the most opposed to internal reforms; so in the Protestant communions, it is among the stationary

parties in matters of doctrine that the work of missions found its most active workers and its most effectual promoters. The progressive Christians, on the contrary, far from being indifferent to the conquests made by the Christian faith among the Pagans, feel that little good would ensue from success at a distance, if in Christian lands themselves, for want of keeping abreast with civilization, it parted with its simplicity and truthfulness. On this subject Dr. Wichern remarked, that foreign missions have often been prejudicial to home missions; he recalled the fact that in the days of Constantine and Charlemagne the progress of the Church among the Pagans in a measure paganized the Church, and regarded it as Luther's finest title to glory that he restored to honour the home mission in Germany. Like him, the progressive Christians consider that their post is in the bosom of Christianity; that their task, like that of the Reformers, is to strengthen religion by its gradual purification; to bring back souls which an ill-satisfied want of light and spirituality often render the prey of incredulity. The Protestant missions among the Pagans, prosecuted at present in the four parts of the world, although in the way of advance and powerfully supported in several directions, have nevertheless encountered, and still encounter, obstacles of various kinds. Some governments fear to see themselves compromised with the populations by the imprudent fanaticism of missionary sects, and prefer the more calm and regular action of the national clergy. Such, in particular, is the case of Holland. The jealous distrust of commercial companies, that of planters and European colonists, uneasy for their monopoly or their domination, have also long thrown impediments in the way of the missionaries. The English Company of the East Indies went so far as to favour, to their

disadvantage, the fanaticism of the Brahmans, and to give countenance to the idolatrous festivals and ceremonies. It is only in 1813 that the English government, listening to the complaints put forth against them, restricted their privileges, which were finally abolished after the insurrection of 1857. For a long time in the beginning of this century, and down to the suppression of slavery, the American planters persecuted those who laboured for the conversion of the blacks. In the South of Africa, the French and English missionaries have much to suffer from the Boers, who on many an occasion have destroyed their most flourishing stations. The trafficking Europeans, on their side, if they do not always try to turn aside the missionaries from their road, do injury to their work by seducing the savages by intoxicating beverages, or by corrupting them with their libertinism. It is painful to acknowledge that it is a war undertaken by England to secure the trade in opium imported from its Indian colonies which opened China to the Protestant missionaries; that quite recently a bill intended to prohibit that traffic was rejected by the House of Commons; and that moreover, as Livingstone complained, pretended evangelists open the field to speculators, who, guided solely by the love of gain, satisfy it by corrupting the morals of the natives.

The missionaries themselves have not always been at the height of their vocation. In the midst of a great number of them, truly devoted men, often courageous even to heroism, some are accused of discharging their duty as a trade, in a kind of mechanical manner, with a language of convention, in stereotyped phrases, sermons formed in the same mould, rarely vivified by sentiments of the heart; others are charged with almost only thinking how to live at ease on the pay, sometimes very good, which they re-

ceive, and, under the pretext of honourably representing the nation by which they are sent, with indulging in luxury anything but apostolic; others, finally, in India and elsewhere, have merited more grave reproaches for their rigour, their fanaticism, their mutual rivalries; some even for their moral unworthiness.

But the greatest obstacles to the success of the missionaries proceed from the difficulty of their work, and specially the difficulty they experience in communicating with the people that they wish to evangelize. Solely among the aboriginal tribes of North America there were four or five hundred dialects totally different, and now that most of them have disappeared with the tribes that spoke them, you find still two hundred clans having each its own tongue. If the missionaries succeed in making themselves acquainted with these idioms, so strange to Europeans, they have to do, now with hordes still sunk in the lowest animalism, all but destitute of the religious sense, such as the negroes of Central Africa; now with tribes who have but the most rudimental and confused notions on the subject—for instance, the Patagonians and the Papous, who know no God but evil spirits, or a great spirit, which is evil, and which they lodge in some remarkable animal; or, finally, they are people whom slight or erroneous instruction has perverted, so as to render them more inaccessible than savages to pure evangelical instruction. These different races are, moreover, enslaved, some to priests or sorcerers, who, seeing in the missionaries trade rivals, feel interested in keeping them at a distance at any cost; others, to governments more or less regular, to aristocracies, to chiefs full of distrust of all foreign influence. In China and Japan, such has been the most frequent cause of the expulsion of the missionaries.

Finally, in certain lands the nomad morals of the natives preclude all instruction, all regular and continuous worship; otherwheres, as in the Fidji Isles, vices of a revolting and inveterate barbarism, perpetual wars between tribes, infanticide, murder of the aged, even anthropophagy, stand in the way of all true religious instruction.

You cannot get over all these impediments by one effort; and sometimes trials are made that are anything but wise and intelligent. While the Catholics, often satisfying themselves with building a church, with baptizing tribes in a mass, with teaching certain external practices, and hold their hearers to be converted when they can make the sign of the cross; the Protestants sometimes imagine that they have gained everything when they have taught their disciples to repeat certain formularies, or have distributed among them Bibles and Testaments which they never read, or if they read would not understand. Instructed by experience, the missionaries have by degrees entered on better ways. They have discovered that the surest guarantee of success is to put themselves into direct and continued relations with those whom they wish to convert, at first by becoming acquainted with their language, and then by a permanent establishment among them. Since the time of Egede, the apostle of Greenland, such is the method which the Moravians have adopted, and they were the first to adopt it. Persuaded that the internal transformation aimed at by Christian instruction ought to be supported by a correspondent transformation in the habits of active life, and that if you neither can nor will impose it by force, you must call it forth by example, they plant themselves in the midst of the Pagans, and by small colonies form agricultural establishments, in which they subsist by the labour of their hands, and which gradu-

ally become points of attraction for the natives. Their success, if not always prompt, is nearly always sure, because it is purchased by indefatigable perseverance. The most illustrious missionaries—Marsden, Livingstone—cease not to insist on the advantage of material progress as a means of spiritual success. The introduction of agriculture among the natives of New Zealand, by supplying subsistence on their own soil, is beginning to wean them from their primitive cannibalism. To these means of success the Protestant societies of our day add one still more efficacious. It is instruction, which, acting early and continuously on young Pagans, unfolds in them, instead of the false and barbarous traditions in which they would have been nurtured, sound moral and religious ideas, which insensibly penetrate into families, and thence into the nation. To-day then, in all their stations, the Protestant missionaries found schools, keep their scholars in them as long as they can before admitting them to baptism, then send the most advanced into seminaries, where the latter are themselves prepared to become heralds of the gospel. Everywhere there has been reason for commending this apostolate exercised by natives, who are in a much better state than strangers to act on the hearts and lives of their fellow-countrymen. On their side, the wives of missionaries (and this is an inappreciable aid peculiar to Protestantism) establish schools for girls, whom they form to virtues and labours fitted for their sex. The Scottish mission in India displays a particular zeal for this kind of missionary effort, and has already obtained by this means, at Tinevelly, among other places, remarkable results. The total number of schools founded by Protestant missionaries contain about two hundred and fifty thousand scholars. Those of Bâle alone reckon more than three thousand.

Doubtless, the instruction given even by European instructors in these schools is often very imperfect. Complaint is made that only a small number of such as have received a university education—one hundred and twenty-five, it is said, since the commencement of the century—enrol themselves as missionaries. But it must be admitted that a more developed knowledge would often be superfluous with pupils whose intellectual culture is so little advanced. The essential is the presence of tact and skill in teaching, and that the ignorance of proselytes is not made use of to the prejudice of good sense and morality. Had not the churches of Europe, now the most enlightened, monks often destitute of instruction for their founders in the Middle Ages? The evangelization of a people is not a work to be accomplished in a day. After those first missionaries, others will come to deepen the furrow which they have cut, to perfect the work which they did but sketch. We may then be excused if we do not look too closely at the extent of their knowledge, or require from them, as Leibnitz would have wished, a science to be found only in collegians. Practical knowledge is more necessary. Simple artizans have been known to succeed better than lettered missionaries. Accordingly, the societies do not disdain teachers who, to a certain acquaintance with the rudiments of general knowledge and experience in the art of teaching, unite the essential moral qualities. Those qualities are devotedness to duty, perseverance, patience, kindness, a veritable interest, an interest living and active, in the temporal and spiritual good of those whom they desire to convert. In these times, as in the earliest days of Christianity, the surest means to get people to embrace Christianity is to get them to love it, and never can teachers succeed so well as by and through

the good-will and tenderness which it inspires. The proper spirit for missionary teaching, as indeed for all teaching, is the spirit of Jesus.

Among savage or barbarous tribes it is the chiefs who, when they have surmounted their first distrust, shew themselves most accessible to Christian preaching; whether it is that their intelligence aids them to comprehend its excellence, or that they find in European civilization a new title of distinction in the eyes of their subjects, or, finally, by their relations with the missionaries they hope to secure self-support from some civilized nation. Among the Bassoutos in the Punjaub, in several islands of the South Sea, at Java, in Australia and elsewhere, the last motive seems to have had most influence.

It happens frequently, as in the Middle Ages, that the conversion of the chief entails that of his clan. Thus at Madagascar, in 1869, the conversion of the Queen suddenly quadrupled the number of her Christian subjects. Often also the conversion of one tribe brings as a consequence that of neighbouring tribes, especially if in any war the converted chief is victorious. In general, as was seen in the Middle Ages the presumed power of the Christian's God to preserve from some danger or plague against which the Pagan divinities had proved powerless, is a decisive circumstance; in cases of doubt or division of opinion, the decision comes from what is called chance; sometimes recourse is had to "the judgment of God," and then the balance inclines to the side of the Christians, who, superior in resources as in civilization, are accounted by the natives favourites of the Deity. It is not, it is true, rare that after the conversion of a part of a people, idolatry for a moment resumes the upper hand, and that the safety of the Christian proselytes is compromised thereby. Then

the aid of a Christian power becomes necessary, now that support may safely be reckoned upon, if however slightly its interests are involved therein: for instance, if it finds in it means of strengthening its preceding conquests, of preparing the way for new conquests, of extending its commerce, of procuring its navigators places for provisioning. Ostertag plainly acknowledges that in the protection granted to missions by Protestant governments, policy played a considerable part; that for the Dutch, for example, the interest was the preservation of the trade of Sumatra, Molucca, Ceylon, which the influence of the Spanish or Portuguese missionaries threatened to alienate. The kings of Denmark were the first to seek Moravian missionaries for the conversion of their Malabar subjects, and recently the Protestant mission had no success in New Zealand till since the Britannic government has taken possession of the country. The same government protects by its treaties, consuls, police, and, when necessary, the cannon of its fleet, the missionaries of India, who in South America at their own expense instruct and baptize the King of the Mosquitoes, who, since 1839, supports the stations at the Cape against the attacks of the Boers, who, at the risk of a war with France, required from that country an indemnity for Pritchard, expelled from Tahiti by the intrigues of Rome (1844), and to secure the deliverance of some missionaries, prisoners in Abyssinia, decreed for that country an expedition difficult and expensive (1867). Sometimes war serves to open Pagan countries to missionaries, who in their turn keep them open for European commerce; and if they are outraged without receiving sufficient satisfaction, those outrages serve as a ground for the occupation or the conquest of the country, as took place in China and Cochin-China

(1840-47). Sometimes, again, as in Afghanistan in 1839, as at Madagascar since 1820, as in Southern Africa since the labours of Livingstone, the mission, on the contrary, prepares the way for the conquest.

Now what down to the present are the real results of the Protestant missions? It is very difficult to make even an approximative estimate. The missionaries, however sincere the reports of a great number of them, are naturally inclined to exaggerate the results of their labour, and to shew the most favourable side to the societies by which they are supported. It is, however, notorious that their hopes are too often hasty and their foresight deceptive: witness those founded for Madagascar, under the influence of this queen or that for China, at the time of the revolt of the Taipings, who, after being represented to the English as Christians, or "almost Christians," turned out to be brigands as formidable to the Christians as the Chinese themselves: witness also those five hundred thousand natives of India whom the messenger of the Pagan missions declared converted, the same year when the missionary Mullens reported at most a quarter. Franklin observed that very often the missionaries believed they had prevailed with the American savages, because, according to the usage of their nation, they abstained from interrupting them in their appeal, but that in coming to an explanation with them they were soon convinced of their error. One of the missionaries to the Lessoutos recounts that very often those who seem to receive their instructions the best, are the first to laugh at them afterwards. Among the savages given to the worship of nature, among those of the South Seas, among the negroes, the Esquimaux, on the admission of authors indifferent or hostile, the missionaries report the most real success, and their devotedness deserves admiration. But

those conversions, when made, are not always very durable. A zealous missionary of our days, M. Casalis, acknowledged that "a truly converted church is obtained only after much time." In a number of cases, the subsequent conduct of the proselytes proves that they had scarcely, if at all, felt the regenerative impulse of the gospel. The King of the Sandwich Islands, at the anniversary banquet on the destruction of the idols, drank to intoxication; difficulty is experienced in getting the new moral teachings observed; then there is the return of Idia, Queen of Tahiti, to Paganism; the Greenland converts became relaxed in their morals after they had tasted European civilization. Beyond a doubt, many savage tribes have perverted their position as converts to drunkenness and prostitution. Thence from time to time revivals are attempted, and they do not always terminate favourably; that, for instance, among the negroes of Jamaica (1860) accompanied by demoniacal manifestations. Sometimes stations which were accounted the most prosperous, as those of British Guiana, have had to be given up. In 1855, the number of proselytes made by the Protestant missionaries since the beginning of this century was calculated to be six hundred thousand. In 1870, it had reached a million. This doubtless is little, compared with the eight hundred millions of Pagans reckoned to be on the face of the globe. In proceeding at this pace, many centuries must pass before the work is completed, and that the more because the number of missionaries, very restricted compared with their task, has latterly continued to decrease. This disproportion between the sums expended and the results obtained, has raised serious objections among the friends of missions. Let us, however, not forget that in such an enterprize the commencements are the most difficult. A forest once planted reproduces and

extends itself. Thus in Oceania, Christianity propagated itself from one island to another with surprising rapidity. Let us also not lose from sight the fact that till this century its first progress in America and elsewhere was effectuated much less by the conversion of the natives than by the establishment of Christian colonies; that owing to the facility of voyages and the frequency of emigrations, colonies ceaselessly extend and new colonies are constantly formed. Now it is observed that savage populations among which Europeans plant their feet, not being able to adapt themselves to the exigencies of civilized life, or endure the system of excitement which they introduce, or pursue in the midst of agricultural populations the hunts on which they exclusively live, or specially, in case of collisions, support the struggle against regular arms, become extinct rapidly. Thus one after the other disappeared, now decimated by plagues, now driven to a distance by European colonists, the savage hordes of North America, of Southern Africa, of Australia, of New Zealand, of Milanesia, of most part of the islands of the Southern Sea, of Labrador, of the Esquimaux, where Christianity established itself without obstacle with the civilized emigrants which took their place. On the territory of the United States there are not more than three hundred thousand Indians, who only occupy it under the good pleasure of the government. As to the half-civilized populations of India, China and Japan, they will not for a long time be supplanted in the vast countries which they inhabit. But their relations always more frequent, their commerce always more intimate, with the civilized nations of Europe and America which open their ports to them, the ever more vivid taste for our civilization which they acquire, exercise an influence more and more difficult to withstand. The civil

schools founded by the English government singularly favour the education of the natives. Every year a greater number of Hindoos repair to England to finish their education, to give themselves to manufactures or to commerce, return home prepared to fraternize with people whose approach they would not have tolerated before, and carry with them new ideas which they try to give effect to in their own country. "The most opulent," says M. Nagel, "found libraries, colleges, bursaries for students." During some years since, learned societies have been instituted at Lahore, Calcutta and Benares; the population shakes off its old torpor, applies to labour; information spreads, communications multiply. Since the overthrow of the Taïcoon in Japan (1868), the Micado, clad with the double authority of priest and king, has quitted his seclusion, emancipated the inferior classes, invited the nobility to take part with him in everything which can favour the education of the people and contribute to the civilization of the country. In the imperial College of Yeddo, directed by learned Englishmen and Americans, there are already more than three thousand pupils. Young Japanese come into Europe and go to the United States to complete their education. Religious liberty, without being formally decreed in Japan, is already as a fact established there. Who can deny the importance of such transformations? How can religious opinions fail to be profoundly modified in these movements? How should not these new ideas, this new morality, infiltrated into the minds of the natives, destroy in time their ancient beliefs, which the vicinity of Mohamedanism had begun to shake? Travellers, missionaries are unanimous in attesting the crumbling away of the old Hindoo superstitions; the scepticism which makes its way into all classes, even into the Brahmanical,

rejected idols, abandoned pagodas, the festivals of Juggernaut which now lack peasants to draw the murderous car; in fine, Buddhism fallen into discredit in Japan, and its temples threatened with ruin.

It would doubtless be a small gain if the Buddhist or Brahmanical beliefs were replaced, as you may see here and there, only by religious nihilism. But the young Hindoos that attend the civil schools or those of the missionaries, those who repair to England to complete their studies in the universities, and there find themselves in daily contact with instructed Christians, if they do not all return in possession of positive Christian beliefs, for the most part carry back at least a culture which raises them without effort to the dogma of the unity and spirituality of God. This Unitarian belief, which was, at the beginning of the century, that of the illustrious converted Brahman, Rammohun Roy, has become that of a sect recently formed in Calcutta under the name of *Brahmo Somaj*, which, already influential, publishes religious tracts, a monthly review, holds regular meetings, and reckons, it is said, fifty thousand adherents, the major part of whom belong to the *élite* of the nation, and occupy in it civil and military posts. Denied by the Hindoos, it is ill regarded by some missionaries, who see in it only a union of Theists. Nevertheless, the society pursues its reformatory views, raising its voice against the prejudice of castes, seeking to elevate the condition of women, sustaining by charity the zeal of its proselytes, and finally propagating a moral Theism which, without foundation it is true, it tries to connect with the primitive beliefs of the country. In every age emigrants from civilized countries, remaining connected with their native centres, have served to propagate sounder religious ideas among the barbarous tribes

in the midst of whom they find themselves. The Greek colonies founded of old in Sicily, Italy, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, Libya, the Roman colonies established in Africa, Gaul, Great Britain, naturalized there less fierce divinities, less absurd forms of worship, more humane morals, religious customs less cruel and shameful. With greater reason the Christian colonies of Europe and America will continue to spread over the earth the worship of the true God. And their influence in this respect will be the more productive in so far as it is impregnated with the spirit of religion. In those distant countries, where too often baneful germs accompany our commerce, our industry and our arts, the action of devoted missionaries cannot be too highly appreciated; it is the reign of the spirit counteracting the predominance of material interests; it is Christian zeal imprinted on the work of civilization; it is the leaven of the sacred word which keeps the bread from becoming corrupt, the salt which communicates to it its savour.

Christianity then, in its relations with other forms of religion, offers us the aspect of a slow but incontestable progress. Through numerous obstacles, but by the aid of modern civilization, which is in part its work, we have seen it make its way in the most different nations, and, even when it does not effect positive conversions, at least by its ascendancy modify their morals, their customs, their religious ideas, and create in them affinities which bring them into some resemblance with itself. Here, moreover, as in its internal progress, we have remarked the concurrence of the different Christian communions and parties into which it is divided.

The old Unitarian party, by its severe monotheism, makes itself respected by the Jews and the Moslems; it finds favour with those of the Hindoos and Japanese

whom contact with Europeans detaches from their national beliefs, and gives birth among them to Theistical sects, of whom some are very near deserving the title of Christian. Christian liberalism in its turn, by its unshaken principles of equity and justice for all, dissipates prejudices still too much spread against Christianity. By the broad access which it opens to inquiry and science, it gains the sympathy of spiritual philosophers, and paves the way for a new catholic reform. Finally, by its love of progress, by the enlightened use which it makes of Scripture, it extends a hand to neo-Judaism, and by its influence disposes it to more and more substitute for the hard formalism of the old law the penetrating unction of the evangelical morals. On idolatrous nations this spiritual proselytism has necessarily less hold; it is on their imagination, much more than on their reason, that we can hope to act. The language of authority, the employment of material symbols, marvellous narratives, even innocent superstitions (if such there are), taking the place of barbarous ones; these are useful auxiliaries with the Pagans, but which only the stationary parties can make use of with sincerity. Dogmas and practices which are unsuitable for well-informed persons, with whom they only injure Christianity, are suitable and operative with such as are uncultivated. The Methodist missionary, with his lowering pictures of the consequences of the first sin, his material paintings of the joys of Paradise, the punishments of hell, his adjurations to secure by a sudden conversion a refuge against everlasting torments and a part in the delights of the New Jerusalem, produces on the negro, on the barbarian, more impression than can the most eloquent preacher with his persuasive accents. On his side, the Catholic missionary, with his images, relics, miracles of the saints, his exorcisms, his

signs of the cross, with the mysterious rites of Mass and Baptism, produces effects less desirable but more prompt. Both, notwithstanding the imperfection of the means which they employ, by the fact that they sow among these people the first seeds of the Christian faith, they also labour at a work of progress, light and civilization.

Thus, we fear not to repeat it, in the field of the Lord there is employment for all well-disposed labourers. It is for each of them to own and accept his own task without hindering his fellow-workmen in that which belongs to them; otherwise much time is lost, harmony is disturbed, and the work is not accomplished. "If," says Paul, "all were only a single member, where would be the body? We are all members one of another. Let not the eye say to the hand, I have no need of thee nor the head say to the feet, I have no need of you." (1 Cor. xii. 21.) The work of Christianizing the world is immense, and requires the efforts of each and all. By these the Church will be spread, by those it will be purified. The brute metal which some will extract from the mine, others will cleanse of its alloy, others will refine in the crucible, and by these combined operations, accomplished under the direction of the Master, under the influence of the same Divine Spirit, the human family, always increasing in number, will be led to the knowledge of its Heavenly Father, in the communion of Jesus.

C. Green & Son, Printers, 178, Strand.